


CONSERVATIVE INDIA

*Says and Essays on the Principles and
Practices of Indian Conservatism with
A Conservative Catechism and
Reflections Obiter Dicta*



BY

Jayendraray Bhagwanlal Durrani

M. A. Vidyā Vāridhī, Dharma Bhāskar,

Retd. Professor of the M. T. B. College

and Principal of the V. T. Hindu Gurukul, Surat ,

AGENTS :

Messrs. Taraporewala & Sons

BOMBAY

Ahmedabad

A. D. 1941

PRICE RS. 3/8/- OR 5/- SHILLINGS.

Printed By

Mr. N. Nicum at the Shanker Printing Press, Surat,
(P. P. 1-180).

Mr. S. S. Saiyadh at the Gnana Mandir Printing Press,
Ahmedabad: (P. P. 1-32 and 181-228)

Mr. Somalal M. Shah at the Gujarat Printing Press,
Ahmedabad: (P. P. XVII-XLVIII)

Mr. Sureshchandra Popatlal Parikh at the Diamond
Jubilee Printing Press, Salapose Road, Ahmedabad:
(P. P. i-xvi P. P. 33-143 and 229-244.)

1040/22

83308

Published By

VYOMESHCHANDRA BHADRAJI DHURU

Raipur, Ahmedabad.

Copies 500

1st Edition

All Rights Reserved to the Publisher.

A NOTE ON THE AUTHOR

The present work is easily a landmark in Indian Conservatism. It is written by a writer of repute, conversant with Indian as well as European Thought, who writes on the side of Conservative Indian ideas and ideals without any mental reservations. He is amongst the few with such views who have academic learning, religious conviction and ample public experience at their back and is thus well qualified to speak on the various subjects which he has dealt with. His Gujarati Works are well-known and his light personal essays have found place in the Text-books of the University of the Bombay. It is a compliment to his religious work and learning that His Holiness the Jagadguru Shankarāchārya of Puri has done him the rare honour of contributing an Introductory Essay to this work, which has been published on the occasion of the Author's Diamond Jubilee recently celebrated in Gujarat.

Ahmedabad, }
12-12-41 }

V. R. DHOLAKIA

By the Same Author

Harmony of Creeds	(A Pamphlet)	Out of Print
Politics & Education	"	Rs. -/4
Indian Education	"	" -/4



Gujarati Books

Thodank Chhutan Phool	(Essays)	Rs. 1/4
Zaranan	(Poems)	" 1/4
Poyanan	(Light Essays)	" 2/-
Swarajya Ne Sanskriti	(Essays)	" 2/-
Ami	(Light Essays)	" 1/8

AGENTS :

Messrs Jivanlal & Sons.

Publishers

Ahmedabad & Bombay.

P R E F A C E

My aim in writing this book is to present the vision of Conservative India in the manifold phases of life. I need hardly say that several friends have told me about the want of a work for such a purpose. I also have searched for one in vain. Otherwise, I should have foregone the task, both on account of my diffidence in wielding a foreign language and the difficulty of wading through a range of subjects as infinite as life. The Theosophists have dealt with the spiritual side of our Conservatism, Swami Vivekanand with its Yogic side, Prof. Radhakrishnan with its philosophical side and Dr. Rabindranath Tagore with the devotional side of its attitudes. But some fundamental phases and usages which touch our society and politics intimately, have remained untouched or unappreciated, perhaps because many of our writers did not themselves think much of them. Orthodox Hinduism, which is the living creed of millions of people of this land and which is the basis of Indian Conservatism, has been still in the penumbra of Western clouds. Men of culture, light and leading while they believe in it or follow it, are often unwilling to be styled conservative, so virulent has been the propaganda of maligning Hinduism in some of its most fundamental aspects. The leadership in this propaganda has belonged not only to foreigners like Lord Macaulay and Miss Mayo, but also to Indian champions of some sides of Hindu culture, like Raja Rāmmohan roy, Swami Dayānanda and in some points, our great Gandhiji.

But Hinduism or the pristine religion of the Human Race is so beautifully pure and perfect that with riper experience and understanding, it is bound to win the hearts not only of Indians but even of unbiased foreigners and open-minded intellectuals of the world. I should feel that one of the aims of this work were fulfilled if it served as a pointer for the study of the greater books of India with more earnestness, reverence and sympathy.

I hope that many of my co-religionists in India will appreciate this work and I should not be surprised if it becomes the first Draft of modern Indian Conservatism. I write not as a neutral, nor with the pose of a neutral, but with the earnestness of a man who believes in the emphasis of his say. There has been enough of the grandiose pose of neutrality and mental detachment. A frank advocate is better and safer than a surreptitious poacher in the realms of intellect and belief.

All of us individually and collectively are confronted with problems of momentous value to life and there are no solutions which can fare better than those which mankind has conserved through saints and sages in the aeons and aeons of its history.

I have no doubt that the sacred books of the world provide complete clues for all the problems of the human race. But they have to be understood and appreciated in the context of modern conditions. Not only they have to be assimilated by the individual but they have to be explained and enunciated anew in terms which the modern mind can appreciate. For this purpose, new falsehoods and fallacies may have to be exposed so that man-

kind in general may have a clearer vision of the perennial truths which would make for its happiness, peace and prosperity. It would not do in these days of ballot-box decisions to say "We will believe in our things and be let alone." We need a justification or a rational representation of our principles and practices before the wider world, and I believe that the great and enduring Indian culture, its principles and practices can amply bear such justification. The technique and method of presentation in this book is not that of a scientific treatise but is variagated with a general perspective, a *Catachism*, *Obiter Dicta*, and different essays presenting different perspectives of the various phases of life from the conservative angle of vision. I shall be all the more pleased if the task thus begun is fulfilled by a versatile genius, and Conservative India presented again in all her beauty and grace, power and profusion, opulence and sublimity.

I take this opportunity of tendering my reverential thanks to His Holiness Jagadguru Shankracharya Shri Bharati Krishna Teerth Swamiji of Puri, who is one of the great Primates of Hinduism in India, for the kindness and honour done by him to me by writing an Introductory Essay for this work.

The book is divided into two parts, Part I being the New Original Portion of the work while the Says and Essays of Part II have been written and published at different times and places as mentioned along with the contents. I need hardly say that additions and alterations have been made where they were thought necessary or useful to the design and scope of the work. The paging of the Parts is also done separately.

I thank also the the various Editors and Publishers of the news-papers and magazines for their kindness in giving publicity to the articles and I count upon their courtesy in reproducing them in this work. The publishing of this book which began in 1938 has passed through several vicissitudes on account of the Author's change of places and thus deserves a bit of the liberal readers' indulgence.

I need hardly reiterate in this preface that the whole emphasis of this work is upon the need of conservation of the great ancient assets of the human race, and amongst them foremost of all, Religion, Kingship, Home and Hermitage.

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS

Subject	Page
A Note on the Author: V.R. Dholakia...	V
By the Same Author	VI
Preface by the Author	VII
Contents	XI
Introductory Essay by H. H. Jagadguru Shree Shankaracharya of Puri ...	XVII-XLVIII

CONSERVATIVE INDIA: Part I

Foreground & Fundamentals

<i>Aum</i>	2
Retrospect of History	3
Evidence of the Senses	7
Reasoning or Logic	10
Absolute Philosophy	13
Ethics	14
From Restiveness to Restfulness	20
Fundamentals of Morality	24
The Complex Universe	26
Principle of Vikriti	27
Origin of Species	30
Common Human Ancestry	31
First Habitat of Man	32
Creation of Man	33
Deterioration of Man	35

Mid-Summer-Night's Dream	36
The State	36
The Mischief of Democracy	38
Its False Basis	40
The Lure of Democracy	42
Dictatorship: Nemesis Democracy	43
Monarchy Versus Dictatorship	43
Liberty and Society	45
Liberty and the State	46
Other Functions of the State	48
Fundamentals in Politics	49
Confusion Worse Confounded... ..	50
The Light of India	51
Conservatism	53
This Mighty Vision	55
Conservative Catechism	57-73
Obiter Dicta	74-142

CONSERVATIVE INDIA: Part II

Says & Essays

(For facility of knowing the Context or Occasion and the Time of Publicity of the various Says and Essays of this Part, their When & Where of initial publication is shown in many of these contents.)

Subject	When & Where	Page
Central Fact of Philosophy :	Indian Philosophical Congress 1928	1
Spheres of Science and Philosophy : , 1937	11

Indian Social System	International Congress of Orientalists, Rome 1935	17
Some character stories	...	30
Religious Education	The Indian Mirror 4-2-33	33
Indian Political Ideals	"	39
A Review of the Congress	" 5-5-34	43
Indian Conservatism	The Indian Mirror 7-7-35	49
The Devotional Poets of Gujarat	...	56
The Significance of Khaddar	The Bombay Chronicle 3-7-30	59
To the Indian Youth	Yuvak Sabha Sammelan, Shikarpur 18-11-35	62
Indian Autonomy and Indian Culture	Swarajya Ne Sanskriti, 1931	67
Oriental Learning	The Times of India	79
The Government and Terrorism	The Dharmarajya 24-11-34	81
Orthodox Hindus and their Rights	The Times of India 12-7-30	88
The Sanatanist movement	Indian Mirror 14-7-34	95
The Temple-Entry Push	Statement at Benares 7-10-32	99
A New System of Representation	The Indian Review May 1935	103
A Delta in Crisis	The Dharmarajya 11-2-37	110
Religious Non-Interference	From Memorial to Secretary of S. for India	113
Carlyle on Modern Democracy	The Indian Review Aug. 1922	124
The Basic Lines of Indian Systems	International Congress of Orientalists, Brussels, 1938	129
The Basic Lines of Ethics	"	143
The Basic Lines of Economics	"	151
The Basic Lines of Politics	"	156
Summary of the Basic Lines	Kalyan Kalpataru Jan. 39	163
Democracy a Camouflage	The Dharmarajya 3-11-38	167
The Right of Dissociation	"	175
The Congress Credo	"	178
The Definition of a Hindu	"	180

Religious Nationalism	The Times of India -2-40 & 3-40	181
	Also Dharma Rajya	
	28-3-40 & 25-4-40	
Communal Amity	The Dharmarajya 16-11-39	189
Implications of a Constituent	The Dharmarajya	
Assembly	7-12-39	220
British Conservatism	A Letter to — 9-12-34	209
Religious Education	Evidence before the Bombay University Reforms Committee	215
The Balance Sheet	...	221
Index	...	231



CONSERVATIVE INDIA



INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

By

HIS HOLINESS JAGADGURU SANKARACHARYA

SWAMI SHREE BHĀRATI KRISHNA TEERTH MAHARAJ

आचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद ।

The Man With the Guru becomes Enlightened.

सर्वदेवमयो गुरुः ।

—श्रीमद् भागवतम् ।

KNOW ME TO BE ACHARYA : KNOW

ACHARYA TO BE MYSELF :

—*Shri Krishna.*

Introductory Essay

(BY His Holiness Jagadguru Shankaracharya
Swami Shri Bharati Krishna Tirth Maharaj).

Strange and stirring, critical and epoch-making are the times in which our lots have been cast – times during which, in the history of the world in general and of India too to-day in particular, we are called upon to face an incessant and tremendous conflict between two different civilisations, two different cultures, two different goals, two different out-looks, two different modes of life and two different frames of mind, in fact, one may go so far as to say, “two different every-things”. It therefore behoves every thinking individual amongst us to weigh the *Pros* and *Cons* carefully, arrive at correct conclusions calculated to lead us triumphantly on to real and lasting progress in all directions and then to act upon those conclusions faithfully. To think carefully, to decide correctly and to act faithfully—these are the three duties before us.

But before we can go on to think out and discuss what is really necessary for us in order to ensure our welfare and our progress all round and before we can hope to agree amongst ourselves as to what these words “Welfare” and “Progress” do and ought

really to mean, denote and connote for us, we should at any rate, be able to start on this enquiry with a frank recognition and admission of the fact that, whatever differences of opinion there may be amongst us as regards the *means*, there is absolutely not the least doubt that we are all in perfect agreement in respect of our *aim* i. e., that all of us are keen on our onward and upward march. Progress is certainly necessary; for, progress, ordinarily speaking, is not merely a sign and a symptom of life but we may go further and even call it a *condition* of life and postulate that, unless there is progress, we may suspect that either there is no life at all or that it is actually deteriorating. This is perfectly true and cannot be gainsaid.

But the real difficulty herein for us arises, because we are apt to think shallowly
The Difficulty and imagine the converse of the just-
Involved now-enunciated proposition to be
 also true and to run on with the
 idea that *change* automatically means and indicates progress. As a matter of fact, it does nothing of the sort. Change for its own sake, change by itself, does not necessarily mean progress. Change will be necessary, change *is* necessary. But, in what direction? This is the chief thing for us to consider carefully and decide accurately. In other words, we all agree that we should be marching along, all the time; but the whole question really is, as to 'whither we should march?'

When we go into this question from the angle of vision just indicated, there is the natural tendency for us to go into one of two directions by sheer force of prepossession for the one and prejudice against the other. There will be those amongst us who will naturally say that because such-and-such is their ancient inherited system, therefore they prefer it; and, on the other side, there are those who would go in for change just because it *is change* ! Both these frames of mind are injurious, because, in the ultimate disposal of the matter, they are likely to lead us wholly astray. They are all the more dangerous because they are generally unconscious, and subtle, insidious tendencies, which we should therefore be all the more vigilantly on our guard against. It is extremely pathetic, in this connection, to note, in passing, that even such a broad-minded and philosophically-inclined poet as the late Alfred Lord Tennyson fell an unconscious prey to this very type of insidious temptation which we have been describing as a very dangerous distorter of our visions and warper of our judgments, when he said :—

“Ring out the old, ring in the new,
Ring out the false, ring in the true”

The *metre* and the rhyme therein are not wrong, of course; but the *matter* of suggestion is all wrong. His ringing out of the old year and his ringing in of the new year were perfectly correct; but when he proceeded further and equated the old with the false and the new with the true, the jingling rhyme

of it was no doubt sweet to the ear, but, as regards the idea itself, we must say that his brain had evidently (though doubtless unconsciously) succumbed to a mechanical idea on the matter of oldness and newness as being probably by themselves sufficient and convincing criteria for inferring falseness and trueness respectively.

Unfortunately, the kind of 'Education' that India is getting at the present day, is of a
The Present lop-sided and most deplorable type
System which by suppressing important,
of Education relevant and necessary facts of History
 of Literature and of Science on the
 one hand and by fabricating and circulating all sorts of half-truths and even utter falsehoods on the other, is calculated to muddle our brains, vitiate and warp our judgments, distort our outlook and make us incapable of looking at and solving the great problems of life in general and of India in particular, from the proper perspective and with a properly balanced sense of proportion. In fact, it is notorious that the very objective with which Lord Macaulay began the present system of "Education" in India was the deliberate one of un-Indianising and then anglicizing the Indians by depriving them of all Indian pabulum, by damping the Indian spirit within them and by making them believe that there was hardly anything great or worth reverencing in India's past; that everything that is worth while in the world has come, is coming and will come to us from the Western world and that the path to national

prosperity and progress consists in the despising and abandonment of everything Indian and the adoption and assimilation of un-Indian and even anti-Indian Western. We need hardly point out that such a system of "Education" is unavoidably bound to be of a most injurious and deplorable character, calculated not to promote but to actually retard India's progress and stunt India's growth in every sphere and activity of life.

In this connection, we may, in passing make a passing reference to the modern **Catchwords and Slogans** tendency to make mechanical use of catchwords and slogans like "Inquilab Zindabad" (Long live Revolution) and so forth, just as if revolution were a good thing by itself and for its own sake, irrespective of the intrinsic merits, the direction thereof etc. Of course, if and when a person has become so diseased that no change of diet, no change of climate, and no medical treatment can possibly do him any good, and an amputation or other major surgical operation gives the only chance for the possibility of saving his life, one has necessarily to get his limbs howsoever dear, amputated. Similarly, if and when a revolution is the one and only method by which the body social which has become too rotten to be cured by other natural methods, can possibly be prevented from impending and immediate death, those who are striving to bring about the welfare and progress of society in general and of a country in particular,

should be unavoidably compelled to accept and make use of such revolution too as a means for the furtherance of their cause and the achievement of success therein. But to talk of revolution for its own sake, at all times, in all places and under all circumstances, can only be described as the clearest possible symptom of shallow and morbid thinking – nay, rather of sheer *thoughtlessness* of the most culpable character.

In this context, we may also refer briefly to the manner in which the self-styled **The "Time Spirit"** 'reformers' of present-day India, constantly speak of the 'Time-spirit' and exploit and invoke its name, as if it were not only irresistible but also a thing which one *ought not to resist*. There can be no worse token and proof of the kind of shallow thinking which passes muster at the present time in India in the name of serious argumentation. Obviously such people forget the elementary – nay, axiomatic – truth of universal experience that, when a river is in torrential floods, it is only the trees and other inanimate matter on both the banks that go mechanically down the current; and that not merely human beings but even cattle and other animals which have been entrapped by the floods do not let themselves be carried mechanically down the stream, but so long as they continue to live, struggle up – or across the stream in that particular direction which, by their own intellectual calculations, they deem the best calculated to ensure their safety and welfare. In

other words, floating down the stream mechanically in the name of the 'Time-spirit' and so forth, is an indubitable feature of *corpses and carcasses*, while careful reflection on all the details of the situation and correct determination of the right course to adopt under all the circumstances in question are the hall-marks of life and the golden keys which alone can unlock the portals to success, peace and happiness in life.

It will not do for us to say that our hearts are sincere and that our intentions are good, and therefore, whatever we **Inexorable** do must pass muster. In actual **Laws of Nature** practice, this is a perverse and dangerous doctrine, because of the elementary Truth which Science places before us and dins into our ears and drives into our hearts, when she says:- Nature is inexorable in her demands and punishes ignorant blundering as severely and relentlessly as she punishes deliberate sinning." There are the Laws of Nature which we are called upon to obey, whether we like them or not. The question is not what our attitude towards these laws (i. e. *restrictions*) is. We may dislike them intensely and from the very core of our heart; but the laws are there, not according to our wishes and inclinations but according to the arrangements made by the Almighty Creator, Preserver and Destroyer of the Universe. And therefore it is hardly our business to express our likes and our precious 'opinion' on these matters. It is but chimerical

for us to say that if we had been entrusted with the work of Creation and if the designing of and the arrangements for the Universe had been placed under our control, we would have designed and created a better world and arranged things in a better way. Just for a moment and just for argument's sake, even if it be granted that God is a downright ignoramus and we (in the plenitude of our ever-changing and ever disappointing wisdom) are wiser people, even then the fact has to be taken into account that it is His law that prevails and not our inclination, however much wiser we may deem ourselves to be than God. So, there is no need for us to waste our time over chimerical descriptions of the wonderful superiority of the things which we could, might and would have created if we had been in God's place. All that we have to do is, to think carefully about what actually is God's Law; learn and decide it correctly; and act faithfully in accordance therewith. We have to work in the world with this as our motto; and our likes and dislikes have absolutely no value as deciding factors in these matters. We have to go on, from day to day, chalking out our lives on lines which will be most beneficial all round, to ourselves as individuals and to the nation as a whole, in the light of His Law.

We, therefore, should not enter upon such an enquiry as the one before us, with
Search after any axes of our own to grind or
Truth any vested interests of ours in favour
of this side or that side; but merely

and entirely as honest, earnest, and conscientious Seekers after Truth and Correct Knowledge, with our dominating interest simply and solely concentrated upon the correct determination of the Truth in all the various departments of life; and this too we have to do, merely because it is the finding out of the correct Principles and Laws of Nature and acting in accordance therewith, that alone can lead us to Peace, Happiness and Joy, here as well as hereafter. And after all, what is it that we are all the time really striving to learn and do ? In terms of bombastic modern terminology, we speak very often of 'conquering' Nature with the aid of Science and so forth. But let us give up all this self-laudation and self-deception and try to find out what is the reality behind all our Scientific and other investigations ? What *does* Science do ? We talk of various things that we have *invented*. Have we ever *created* anything at all ? Never; absolutely never. Everything is there already. When the carpenter makes a table for us, he does not create anything at all. The wood is there already in the forest; he brings the God-made wood from the God-made forest, cuts it into pieces, puts the pieces in different places, gives to the wood a different shape; thereupon calls it by a different name and calls himself a great designer, maker and manufacturer ! And even the giving of the new shapes, mind you, has to be in strict accordance with the Natural Law governing the matter and existing already. Similar is the case with electric

lights and other inventions of the same kind. The Electricity is there, already, in Nature; and all that we do is to find out the Laws of Nature governing these matters, take advantage of the thus-ascertained knowledge of these rules and profit thereby. There is nothing else that even the greatest of Scientists does or can ever possibly do; and this is exactly why the Scientist speaks of such-and-such a *discovery*, in as much as he has merely *dis-covered* what was covered (i. e. concealed) from our gaze.

Now, as all processes of investigation, whether Theological (Scriptural), introspectional or otherwise, must necessarily be directed towards the discovery of the hidden Truths of Nature in all the various departments of life, it stands to reason that the word of God as revealed to us in the pages of the Scriptures, the pages of Nature around us and Introspection from within, must be the same. If, at any time, we feel the existance of a conflict or an irreconcilable inconsistency between any two of them, we may be perfectly sure that we have misread or misunderstood one or per chance both of them! There is no possibility of our having read and understood both aright and yet found a real conflict between them

If we now take up our study of Religion from this standpoint of the internal Harmony that must naturally and necessarily subsist between the results of our various investigations on different lines and in different directions, we

**No Real
Conflict**

**Religion, Philo-
sophy and
Science**

are astonished and gratified to find that, from this point of view too, our Sanatana Dharma usually called Hindu Religion is the only one that can stand this test and come through absolutely unscathed. So much so that the greatest philosophical minds of the Western world from Plato of ancient Greece down to Carlyle, Emerson, Immanuel Kant, Hegel, Mackenzie and other great giants of modern Philosophy and even Astronomers like Sir James Jeans have been all constrained to pay their hearts' tribute to India's Idealistic Philosophy, in spite of their natural temperamental predelection in favour of Western Realism. And, on the other side, the discoveries recently made by eminent scientists in different branches of the "Positive" Sciences are throwing new light on and confirming and proving the ancient Truths of the Karmakanda, the Upasanakanda and the Gnana-kanda of Sanatana Vaidika Dharma, from a most unexpected, nay, undreamt of direction

Sanatana Dharma has thus this wonderful advantage, namely, that, not only does it
The Advantage claim to have come from the Lord Himself from the very beginning of the world as a *Religious* system but, that, at the same time, it also duly caters and provides for all the varied and variegated conditions, efforts and capacities of the infinite multiplicity of Souls that go to constitute Aspiring Humanity. Let us now pass on to consider still another point connected with this question of Dharma in general and Sanatana Dharma in particular.

And this is that *Sanatana Dharma* has been most appropriately so named for various reasons. The first word *Sanatana* **The Meaning of Dharma** is easy to translate; it means Eternal; but the second word *Dharma* is difficult to translate into English, because there is absolutely no word which can correctly convey, in English, what the word 'Dharma' denotes and connotes to us in Sanskrit and all the various languages of India. It may be roughly translated as "Religion"; but this is really a very unsatisfactory rendering thereof, because the very conception which the Western mind has of Religion is something very narrow and restricted in its scope, nay, in its very nature too. It is not all-comprehending as our *Sanatana Dharma* is, in the sense that it *Pervades and Permeates* every activity of ours in every branch and department of life, not merely from our birth to our death but commencing long before our birth and continuing its rule over us for long ages after our death !

Thus, as regards the various Departments of Life and Knowledge coming under the **Jurisdiction of Dharma** jurisdiction of Dharma according to the *Sanatani Scriptures*, the very conception thereof is absolutely foreign, nay, apparently even impossible, to the followers of those religions which make such tremendous noise around us. To them Dharma is something of an intensely narrow, cramped, cabined, restricted and circumscribed character; and this is why there is no

word in English for correctly translating all that the word *Dharma* means to us Our Sanatana Dharma-shastra defines Dharma thus:—

धारणात् धर्म उच्यते ।

(i e., Dharma is that which prevents us from going down or ruining ourselves in any manner or respect whatsoever and makes for our welfare, progress and uplift all-round). It is not something very small and circumscribed (like “Religion” in the western sense and application of the word) but really and thoroughly all-comprehending, as it knows no limitations of any kind whatsoever.

For example, besides the fact that our Vedas themselves deal not merely with the
Its Contents means required for the attainment of Happiness and Joy in a future world as the Scriptures of other Religions too claim to do, but also prescribe the necessary means for the securing of Happiness and Joy on the Physical, Material and other so-called purely “secular” planes of life (during this life itself), there is also the eloquent fact that the very names of our four Upa-vedas, i. e. Ayurveda (which includes Anatomy, Physiology, Medical and Sanitary Science and Surgery), Dhanurveda (including Archery and other Military Sciences), Gandharvaveda (the Science and Art of music) and Sthapatyaveda (i e. Architecture, Engineering, Sculpture, Drawing and Painting) will suffice to show how wide is the range of Sanatana Dharma’s jurisdiction. Similarly, the inclusion within

the Vedangas of व्याकरण (Grammer), छन्दः (Prosody), निरुक्त (Lexicography), ज्योतिष (Astronomy) and other such departments of what the modern western world would call purely "secular" knowledge, will also clearly show and conclusively prove this very same unique feature of Sanatan Dharma.

Thus, for instance, we find the Manu Smriti and other sacred scriptures of Sanatan Dharma telling us:-

नाम्सु मूत्रपुरीषे कुर्यात् ॥

"Thou shalt not pass urine and stools in any reservoirs of water." If and when a Westerner reads the English translation of a passage like this, he jumps up at once and says:—"This is a matter of purely Sanitary Science; what has this got to do with Religion?" And our reply is that, just *because* it has to do with our welfare and happiness (in any plane of life), therefore, it is *ipso facto* a part of our Dharma. And, similarly, it needs no elaborate pointing out that it seems almost impossible even to conceive of the Western world ever recognising the study of Grammer, Prosody, Lexicography, Astronomy and other such "purely secular" departments of knowledge as necessary and inherent parts of *Religious* study.

But our Sanatana Vaidika Dharma includes, within its all-comprehending jurisdiction, all departments of knowledge (including all branches of what,

in modern terminology, we speak of as the Positive Sciences) It is, therefore, in the fitness of things, that our Sanatana Dharma, which has not merely existed from the time of creation but has to, and does cater for all kinds of Adhikaris (persons of different conditions of fitness) has therefore naturally made all the necessary provisions for all the different activities of life by going into detailed disquisitions on all the varied requirements thereof and setting forth an all-embracing and thorough-going system of injunctions and prohibitions, correct and faithful adhesion whereto is not only intensely and extremely *useful* but also positively and absolutely *necessary* for the attainment by us of all-round Health, Strength, Peace, Happiness and Joy of body, mind and spirit

Undoubtedly, it is this very fact that is responsible
 for the intensely wonderful and
The Positive immensely gratifying confirmation
Sciences which the precepts of our Sanatana
 Dharma have been systematically

receiving of late on their intrinsic merits, from Modern Science in all its multifarious branches. It is clear, therefore, that the Sanatana Vaidika system was based, not merely in its general plan and outlook but also in every one of its details. on a thorough-going and thoroughly scientific basis of the most unexceptionable and far-reaching character, which took into account all the various phases and aspects of life, physical, material, mental, intellectual, moral, political, industrial, economic, psychic, spiritual and others.

And, on the Historical side, too, this fact is splendidly confirmed by the researches **Their Historical** carried on by Professor DeMorgan **Relationship** and other intellectual stalwarts in Mathematics, Medicine, Chemistry, Acoustics and other departments of "Positive" Science, whereby it has been established, beyond all possibility of doubt, that all the various branches of Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Medical Science and other "Exact" Sciences (which we, moderners, pride ourselves on as our great speciality) really went out of India to Arabia, Egypt, Greece, Rome and other parts of the Western world and that, even now, there are huge lots of not merely advanced but even elementary material in these Sciences as described in our Ancient Scientific Literature, even the fringe whereof the most advanced researches and discoveries of Modern Science have not yet reached and are yet to negotiate

Innumerable other branches of knowledge and departments of human activities come **Other Subjects** similarly under Sanatana Dharma; We need not enumerate here even the most important ones amongst them. Suffice it just now to point out that Sanatana Dharma covers, within its purview, an illimitable range of subjects, including Civil Law, Politics, Civics, Economics, Industries and a great many other "purely secular" subjects too.

Let us now turn our attention to, and study the picture of India's History, and compare and contrast it with the history of Greece, Rome and other empires, and observe the salient point or points of difference in the actual history thereof and trace therefrom and determine for ourselves the inevitable differences in outlook, ideal, cult, principles and mode of life which must necessarily have accounted for the serious differences thus observed in the actual history. Have we, in India, from ages past, paid such attention to any such Cult of Efficiency, Law and Order and so forth as made Greece, Rome and other empires great in the past? The answer to this question is "Yes" and "No"! It is "Yes" to some extent but not to the same extent as in Greece, Rome and elsewhere and, therefore it is, to some extent, "no"! Let us go into this a little deeper down and analyse things clearly for ourselves

The Spartan Ideal of Efficiency was certainly given a high place in India's Sanatani India and Scriptures too. In fact, the great Efficiency value, the tremendous importance, and the absolute necessity of Brahma-charya for achieving perfect Physical and Intellectual Efficiency have been insisted on in our Scriptures as they have been insisted upon in no other Scriptures of the world. The Perfection of the Individual, physically and intellectually, in order to make his body and his intellect absolutely perfect instruments in his hands for achieving his goal - this was and has

always been our Hindu ideal. But in spite of all this emphasis and insistence on perfect and all-round Efficiency, it must be carefully noted that this seeming Ideal of Efficiency is, according to our Scriptures, really not an *Ideal* for and by itself, but really and merely a *means* to the realising of another and a Higher Ideal which is the real objective of the Sanatani Scriptures. What this real, higher and ultimate goal was, we shall presently see

As regards Law and Order too, it may be truly said that no nation, no race and no Religion in the history of the world has ever emphasised Law and Order in the way that India, the Hindus and Sanatana Dharma have done. The tremendous stress laid on Discipline i. e., on absolute and implicit obedience on the part of the Son towards the Father, the Younger towards the Elder brother, the servant towards the master, the disciple towards the Guru, the Praja towards the Raja, and so forth, is a characteristic and unique feature of Sanatana Dharma which is too well-known to need elaborate substantiation, exposition or even illustration. And, yet, even here, the seeming ideal is not really an *Ideal* by itself but only subordinate to a Higher Ideal which is the real objective. In fact, one might correctly sum up the whole position herein by saying that whatever contributing factor towards National greatness be taken into consideration – be it physical efficiency, military prowess, financial strength, intellectual acumen, power of organisation, self-forgetting service of the country

or any other factor whatsoever – every one of these items was taken into account and actually enjoined too by our Scriptures but not a single one of them was the actual *Ideal*; each of them was there only as a *means* towards a specific end; and each such means was carefully considered with a due and vigilantly-balanced sense of proportion and perspective and ordered to be made use of and acted upon in accordance with the requirements of a perfectly co-ordinated plan into which all the several means fitted to perfection.

And what was this real objective? The only method by which we can rightly understand this, is to study the attitude of Sanatana Dharma towards the hitherto-mentioned ideals and cults of other nations and the exact place given to them in the Sanatani scheme of national life.

(i) As regards efficiency, the Upanishad – text. –

नायमात्मा बलहीनेन लभ्यः ।

shows clearly that, according to the Sanatani conception of life, not merely worldly success but even Spiritual Self-Realisation is impossible except on the basis of all-round Strength. The examples of Shri Hanuman, Bhishma and other great Brahmacharis of Ancient Indian History will go to show how, in ancient India, the Ideals of perfect Physical Efficiency and Intellectual Efficiency were always put together and found to go together as contributory factors to success. But they were not desired for

their own sakes but only as a *means* for achievement of Dharma and thereby of Spiritual Efficiency. The passage in the Bhagavad Gita which says:—

बलं बलवतां चाहं कामरागविवर्जितम् ॥

(i) e; that Strength alone which is free from the influence of the passions at its source and from tyrannical tendencies in its effect is of the Divine nature) makes this clear, namely, that the Sanatani Cult of Efficiency is not of the Spartan type which places a premium on physical prowess and intellectual “Cuteness” achieved at the expense of all Spiritual and even moral considerations but of one which brings them all together and keeps them under the control of and in subjection to Dharma.

(ii) Similarly with regard to Law and Order; it will be noticed that the striking and unforgettable instances of Prahlada *Versus* Hiranyakashipu, Vibheeshana *Versus* Ravana, Bhishma *Versus* Parashurama and so on, throw light on the fact that even the Law of Discipline and Obedience was one which came under the Higher Law of Subordination to Dharma. And this is why we have Shri Krishna saying in the Bhagavad Geeta:—

धर्माविरुद्धो भूतेषु कामोऽस्मि भरतर्षभ ॥

(That desire is of the Divine Nature which is not inconsistent with Dharma.)

(iii) In the same manner, it can be seen that all the other desirable factors in life which can possibly make for individual or National prosperity, progress and success are all permissible to us; but, at the same time, even the best and the loftiest amongst them

has to be under the control of Dharma, which ought to be our predominating consideration at all times, in all places and under all circumstances.

Here then, in India, we have the unique instance of a country wherein, for myriads of years past, we have subordinated every other imaginable consideration to Dharma; and looking from its own characteristic secular standpoint at our adhesion to Dharma, the Western world has dubbed us mad. Well, there is no gainsaying the fact of this devotion of ours for Dharma; in fact, we *have* been made like this for years past. And yet, what is the actual and ultimate result of this long-continued madness of ours after Dharma? This is what we should impartially consider and ponder over. In spite of all their rational, intellectual and boasted Scientific discoveries of varied, wonderful and even cocksure means for keeping themselves not merely alive and eternal but even for dominating over the rest of the world, all the other great Empires of the past have gone out of existence altogether. They rose rapidly to a pinnacle of greatness; and, more rapidly still, they crashed down and have gone out of the world altogether. But, what about us? Without all these means, namely, the Cult of Physical, Intellectual and All-round Efficiency, of Law and Order and so forth which these empires adopted in the past and which their successors of the western world have relied on and been clinging to at the present day, India existed long before the history of those great countries began to be thought of or even dreamt of! India

existed from those days; and India exists even now and, that too, not in a weak effete kind of existence but is living and to put it roughly and bluntly in telling slang, vigorously kicking on, all the time ! Even the mighty and puissant British Government in India, with all its tremendous military strength and so forth, passes days and nights anxiously, because of the *political* situation in India at the present day ! What is the secret underlying the vitality of India ? We have not adopted those varied means which the other Empires were anxiously and earnestly after and did actually and assiduously employ, all the time. They believed in those other means; and those other means deceived them, disappointed them and left them in the lurch at the hour of crisis, nay, threw them over-board altogether. But we have believed in and been keen after Dharma all the time and subordinated all other considerations thereto; and, yet, in spite of all the disadvantages and handicaps, which are the natural and inevitable consequences of foreign invasions and foreign rule, not merely political but even cultural, which India has been subjected to for several centuries past, (in fact, for more than one thousand years) – in spite of all these disadvantages and handicaps, we are still alive as a nation. What is this vitality of India due to ? This is the secret which it is our purpose, in the course of this foreword to unroll and unravel. When we have unravelled this secret, namely, of India's vitality, we shall, automatically have unravelled the secret of India's greatness – nay, of all lasting greatness. To sum up, it is an indubitable fact of history

that although other great Empires, depended upon Physical prowess, Military power, Financial strength and Intellectual acumen and all sorts and combinations of other such external aids to continued existence and domination, their prominence and suzerainty have passed away into nothingness; while we who have always refused to place any reliance on any of these varied means to lasting historical existence, success and supremacy, and who have suffered for more than a thousand years from all the normal and inevitable disadvantages and handicaps naturally engendered by and necessarily consequent on Foreign rule and Foreign invasions (not merely political but even cultural) we are still alive as a nation. What is the secret of this vitality of ours ? This is the Question of Questions for us to try and answer.

Now, what is the secret of this wonderful all-round vitality behind India ? It is
The Secret none of those things which the other
of it all Empires relied on and which disappointed and deceived them and left them in the lurch at the critical moment. What is that particular thing, that particular means, which we can possibly think of as being responsible for India's astounding greatness in all respects ? By a simple process of elimination, we can easily see for ourselves that the only possible explanation of this great phenomenon is to be found in that particular thing which our Scriptures on the one hand and our actual History on the other, have always given the place of honour and predominance over everything else in the world, to *Dharma*. We have actually been dubbed

mad on account of this adhesion of ours to Dharma and yet, what has been the result of the wisdom of the others and of the madness of India? The effect of *their* wisdom was to exterminate them and wipe them off the face of history and the map of the world! And the consequence of *our* madness has been to keep us Eternally alive! Should we not then prefer this madness of ours (which has protected us through thick and thin for myriads of years on end) to that worldly wisdom of theirs which they prided themselves on and which, in the actual result threw them overboard beyond all possibility of redemption? In the light of the review which we have so far taken of the Comparative History of the other Empires of the world and of India down to the present day, and in view of the fact that India has ever constantly, consistently and persistently subordinated all other considerations to Dharma and been mad after Dharma in the manner hereinafter described, are we not justified, under these circumstances, in laying our hand on this very madness of ours after Dharma and in emphatically declaring and proclaiming to the world from the house-tops:—
 “Here, here, in this very adhesion of ours to Dharma, is to be traced and found the real, the ultimate and the only Secret of India’s Greatness and of her Vitality ”

Speaking of this Eternally continued Existence of India, resting not on the basis of the various external aids and strengths which the other Empires of the world built themselves on and relied

Tennyson’s

“Brook”

and depended upon for their continued existence, but on what the Western world would contemptuously speak of as "the utterly flimsy foundations" of Dharmic fanaticism, we are always reminded of the English poet Alfred Lord Tennyson's little poem "The Brook", in which a small stream which flowed perennially and never dried up even during the hottest part of Summer, is represented by the poet as describing this fact in the beautiful couplet:-

"Men may come and men may go
But I go on for ever!"

Adapting and slightly altering these words of Tennyson, we would say in this context:-

"Empires may come and Empires may go
But India goes on for ever!"
"Religions may come and Religions may go
But Sanatana Dharma goes on for ever!"

And, from this point of view, considering the questions before us to-day, we believe, sincerely and most conscientiously, **Life as a Harmonious Whole** that Sanatana Dharma is that Divine system of Dynamic thought and Dynamic plan of Life, which has ordained and enjoined for us the best path for the achievement of Humanity's Goal and for fulfilling its purpose not on this plane or that plane alone, but in all the planes and spheres imaginable with which human Life comes into contact, in one way or another. The spiritual, the moral, the intellectual, the physical, the economic, the political and all the various standpoints have to be taken into consideration, before we can decide and adjudicate on the great problems of Happiness and

Misery. And Sanatana Dharma, is, as we have already pointed out, the only system of thought which has made provision for this all-round outlook on Life. Other faiths look at these questions from the point of view of happiness in a *future* world i. e. after this life on earth is over. In other words, the future existence *after* Death is what they mainly take into consideration. But in the Sanatani system of thought, there is absolutely no branch and no department of life, no time, no place, no circumstances and no subject left out of account, past present or future. Nay, each and every branch, department, activity, plan and need of life has been taken into the reckoning and duly provided for And all the various "*Positive*" Sciences and Arts too come in as integral parts of our Dharma.

We are concerned with the propounding of the undeniable fact that, not only according to our own beliefs and according to our experience, but also in the considered opinion and estimation of the greatest souls, not merely of the Eastern World but even of the Western World in the region of Metaphysics, Psychology and so forth to-day, Sanatana Dharma alone gives us that system of thought, that outlook, that ideal and those details of policy and procedure as are in the highest interests of Humanity all round. For example, professor Mackenzie (of University College, Cardiff) has declared openly that, in his considered opinion, there is no system of thought superior or even equal to Sanatana Dharma.

By birth and by faith, he is a Christian; and yet, he is compelled to and therefore does honestly admit that our Indian Religious and Philosophical system (which he speaks of as the "Brahmanic" system) is the only one which can satisfy the human intellect and which can bring peace to the human soul. This is a high testimony from the Western World coming so clearly from one who is one of the greatest present-day psychologists and metaphysicians of Europe.

Now, a comparative and detailed analytical study of India's Past and Present in all the departments of life, forces us to the conclusion that India was great in the past and continues to be great to the present day but, in very meagre and slender proportion to her greatness of remote and even of the immediate past. Applying the elementary principle of India's Tarka Shastra (Science of Logic), which enjoins the method of *Anvaya Vyatireka* on the basis of तत्सत्त्वे तत्सत्त्वं तदभावे तदभावः for determining all such matters relating to Cause and Effect (i e. if two things are so related to each other that the existence of the one has always carried with it the existence of the other, the absence of the one has always been accompanied by the absence of the other and the deterioration of the one has always been attended with the deterioration of the other, then the two things in question must necessarily be bound together by the relationship of *Cause and Effect*), we can draw for ourselves the elementary syllogism that when India was great in Dharma, she was great all

round; that when she fell away from Dharma, it was the signal for her decline all round; that what little proportion of external (i. e. political, economic, physical and such other) prosperity she still possesses is in direct proportion to her adherence to the practice of Dharma and that therefore, Dharma and all round prosperity are thus related to each other as Cause and Effect. In other words, not merely happiness in a *future* world but also physical strength, intellectual acumen, political power and economic progress – in fact, all the factors which *here and now* go to make up all round prosperity, are the natural, concomitant and inevitable consequences of Devotion to Dharma. And this is why we find Shri Krishna saying in the Gita:—

यः शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य व्रतते कामकारतः ।

न स सिद्धिमवाप्नोति न सुखं न परां गतिम् ॥

तस्माच्छास्त्रं प्रमाणं ते कार्याकार्यव्यवस्थितौ ।

ज्ञात्वा शास्त्रविधानोक्तं कर्म कर्तुमिहाह्वसि ॥

(“Whoever, disregarding the dictates of the Shastras acts according to his own inclinations, he cannot achieve success here below, cannot attain to Heaven and cannot obtain Moksha. The Shastra therefore is the authority whereby you should discriminate between what you should do and what you should not do. Learn the teachings of the Shastras and act in accordance therewith”) The Sanatan Dharmis’ belief in and inalterable faith in Dharma, as exemplified in the dictum: यतो धर्मस्ततो जयः । (Dharma and Success go together) is thus found absolutely justified by our historical study of India as compared with other countries on the one hand and with India of earlier

periods on the other. We can conscientiously say that, if any one will, with absolutely no prejudice and no prepossessions in his mind, go in for a detailed and thorough-going comparative study of the Sanatani Scriptures and the other scriptures of the world and will also study the Modern Positive Sciences with an open mind, such a study will certainly bring home to his mind the beauty, the magnificence and the importance of the Sanatan Dharma, even more impressively and successfully than a mere study of the Sanatani Scriptures alone. For when one studies one's own Scriptures and is asked to believe in certain things, on the basis of mere Faith (whether we call it reverently the "eye of faith" or irreverently, "blind faith") there is the possibility to be taken into account of doubts coming into one's mind on such matters, because these teachings come from an interested and one-sided source; and therefore there is room for this much natural doubt at least. But, when favourable testimony comes from what is obviously and undeniably, an enemy source—(a source interested in decrying our Scriptures and our Dharma altogether and yet, unfortunately forced by the logic of historical facts as narrated in its own Scriptures themselves and by the Logic of Demonstrated Experimental Science to bear testimony—unconsciously nay, even unwillingly, to the greatness of Sanatana Dharma,) then, one can, must and will feel that the position of Sanatana Dharma, under such circumstances, is absolutely unshakable. It is our contention that such evidence of a continuous, convergent, incontrovertible and irrefutable character is available from the Bible and the Scriptures of other

religions on the one hand and from Science too on the other. That such in reality is the case, we have often, in the course of our public discourses, demonstrated, by means of quotations and illustrations of a clinching character, taken from both such directions.

It is an elementary axiom that what the Almighty Creator and Ruler of the Universe has Himself ordained, none can alter, let alone destroy. All that the best, the highest and the ablest amongst us can possibly do is to investigate carefully, learn correctly and obey faithfully, the Laws governing the Universe. Sanatana Dharma – the Eternal Religion – has given us, in full and elaborate detail and in the shape of the requisite Injunctions and Prohibitions, all the knowledge necessary for this purpose and the means for attaining it. And Knowledge is Power.

We have no quarrel with Science or Democracy. We verily believe that Sanatana Dharma teaches us the highest Truths of Science and is in full accord with True Democracy; and we are one hundred per cent for India's Reascension as speedily as humanly possible to that sublime Pinnacle of Glory which used to be hers of yore in every respect in the scale of nations. We are nationalists to the core; and we wish India to rise to the loftiest heights of Absolute Perfection conceivable in the Spiritual, Psychic, Ethical, Intellectual, Physical, Political, Economic, and every other direction. We are convinced that the path laid down by the Shastras is the only one whereby we can, in reality, re-attain and retain our Goal. The latest

developments of Modern Science are continually throwing new wonderful light on and proving the ancient Truths taught by our Scriptures. The little-understood and the less-assimilated smattering of western Theology, Philosophy, Sociology and Science which the present lop-sided system of Education has been giving to our people in India, has, however, been perverting their minds and leading them into paths of delusion. The *hearts* of such people may be perfectly pure and sincere but it is a scientific truism that Nature punishes ignorance as severely and relentlessly as she punishes deliberate sinning.

Sanatana Dharma being in reality of the dynamic character already explained, it naturally follows that it is the duty of **Conservation of Dharma** all thinking human beings not to throw away or make light of but drive the fullest possible benefit from the Scriptures containing such valuable Injunctions and Prohibitions calculated to bring about Humanity's real Progress and to save the Race from all-round deterioration. In other words, it is our duty not only to *preserve* but also to *conserve* our Dharma and to *observe* it in daily practice. It is in this sense—the really right and historical derivative sense of the terms that the talented author thinks and speaks of Conservative India. And it is from this outlook that he has dealt with some of the most momentous problems which clamour for solution at our hands to-day in India.

A word may be said just here about the name of this book. The author has called it **Conservatism in the Right Sense** "Conservative India". It must be admitted that, in English political parlance used in India, the word "conservative" has unfortunately an unsavoury association with an English Political Party which is supposed to be, nay, has often been an advocate of reactionary political activities and that the conservative party's opponents in England are known as Liberals and are known to be advocates of "Progress." Whatever justification there may be for this kind of impression about the conservative party and liberal party in the history of English politics, the fact still remains that the words Conservative and Liberal have no such *intrinsic meanings*, that there is really no quarrel between real Liberality of heart (as indicated by a persistent desire for the welfare and progress of mankind) and real conservatism (in the sense that one wishes not to lose but to take the fullest advantage of one's ancient heritage) and that we should not allow any such unsavoury historical associations of Western Politics with these *words* to prejudice us in favour of the one and against the other.



CONSERVATIVE INDIA

I

Foreground & Fundamentals

॥ निरस्तकुहकं सत्यं परं धीमहि ॥

We meditate upon the Supreme Truth with the penumbra
passed away.

Bhagavata Purana (I. I.1)



चित्सदानंदरूपाय सर्वधीवृत्तिसाक्षिणे ।
नमोवेदान्तवेद्याय ब्रह्मणेऽनन्तरूपिणे ॥
वज्रसूचिकोपनिषद् ।

*Bow unto the multi-formed Brahman
Which is Life, Vitality and Joy in essence
Which is the witness of all mental phases
And Which is knowable by the finale of the Vedas.
Vajrasūcika Upaniṣad.*



ब्राह्मणो जायमानोऽहि पृथिव्यामधिजायते ।
ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानाम् धर्मकोशस्य गुप्तये ॥
मनुस्मृतिः । (१. ९९)

**The Enlightened Saint with his very springing up rules
the world. He is the sovereign of the whole creation for the
conservation of the religious treasure.**

Manu (I. 99)

CONSERVATIVE INDIA

FOREGROUND & FUNDAMENTALS

ॐ (*Aum*), the mystic *Logos*, sums up in one expression, in a nutshell so to say, the History of the whole Universe. It is made up of three sounds ' a ' (अ) the beginning, ' u ' (उ) the intermediate, and ' m ' (म्) the final sounds of all organisms. Sound is but the physical manifestation of Energy, and therefore is the fundamental reality which expresses itself through various manifestations. This Energy is not only Life but it is also Vitality. It is not only Vitality but also Exuberance We speak of it as ' *Atman* ' (आत्मन्) and we shall use that word hereafter also for want of a better.

Retrospect of History

All Sciences presuppose certain assumptions. They take certain things as granted. When we examine those ulterior data in the light of Philosophy, we find that they melt away. History also is subject to the

same weaknesses. The historian takes as granted that certain documents or writings are acceptable; that the judgment of his intellect, with its prejudices and prepossessions, is reliable; that, above all, what appears to the senses and is comprehended by the mind is reliable. It is well-known however that judgements on the same events and about the same individuals vary with the angles of vision not only with different men but also with the same onlooker. Then again, there are so many factors in the causation of an event, that a human investigator, howsoever earnest and industrious, cannot see all the causes which led to the event. We take it therefore that all the so called history written by men is but an interpretation of history according to their own lights and leanings, that true history in its full and proper perspective can come only through Omniscience.

When we talk of history we take also some philosophical assumptions as granted. We take it that the Universe objectively exists and that it has existed in a chain of historical connection for a long time. Whether this assumption is correct or not depends upon certain ulterior decisions of philosophy. The whole Universe may be but an idealistic vision, a phantasmagoria, brought about by something we may not know. It may be but a reflex of the 'Atman' itself, having no objective validity. And this very philosophical fact may be behind the variety of human judgments regarding Truth and Universe. It is just possible, in a similar way, that the self-same 'Atman'

is perceiving a Kaleidoscope through different minds, which are the multifarious organs of its perception, and the variety in human judgments may thus become accountable

Under such circumstances it is no wonder that people have said that "History teaches nothing." History has been, in the hands of able writers, only a means of conveying ideas, doctrines and ideals. Impartiality or neutrality in history is usually an imaginary article. Men cannot go beyond their own sub-conscious or unconscious natures and influences, predilections and prejudices, longings and limitations. The same is the case with all knowledge and learning. Even in the interpretation of physical facts it is so. Much more so it is in the case of events which happened thousands of years ago. Men hardly understand their own near relatives and it is infinitely more difficult to rightly understand a complex event of a society or a country in which numerous minds were involved. So long as men deal with the fringe of history which does not vitally touch the present, except as a convenient speculative interpretation of the past, they usually enjoy the safety of the negligible or the advantage of the profitable interpretation.

So then we may take the historical interpretation of men and eras imbued with certain prejudices as more or less unreliable. We have hinted already that looking at the complexity of human affairs and the limitations of human capacities, it is usually so of all men-made history. We have also mentioned that

only Omniscience on the part of its maker would make history reliable. The universe has existed from long long ago and the most ancient knowledge known as having been derived from the Omniscient is concentrated in the earliest human records which are known as the "*Veda*" or "Knowledge". The *Vedas* or the ancient reliable knowledge, have, as the most precious possession of the human race, been preserved by their special Preservers – the *Brahmanas* through a regular succession of technically perfect traditional learning. They bear all the hall-marks of origin from the Omniscient. They have come down from times immemorial; their language is 'Sanskrit' the most wonderfully perfect original language of the world; they have been preserved with all the sanctity and perseverance with which such divine knowledge should have been preserved. They contain or provide in entirety everything that is good in the later scriptures of the human race. Unfortunately many portions of the '*Vedas*' have been lost through aeons or ages of Time. But a good many portions of the *Vedas* have remained and it is especially fortunate that Veda Vyas Badarayana, the great Divine who rearranged the *Vedas* and had the Divine vision of Knowledge has left for human enlightenment the history of the universe very succinctly in the '*Puranas*'. The difficulty with the *Puranas* however is that like the narrations of one who knows the whole, they have blended in them physical, psychic and super-psychic events into one stupendous whole. Therefore while it is the most perfect history

available to man, it is very difficult to separate the various portions of the physical, the astral and the spiritual events and planes from one another. But they pre-eminently serve the great purpose of History, viz, enlightenment regarding the totality of the past. We shall therefore take occasionally some sidelights from these great works for our view of the eras about which mere speculation is but a wandering in darkness. We shall use the human materials according to our lights and the beaconlights of the past.

The *Modus Operandi* in this retrospect will be to take a bird's eyevew of principles and foundations, and how they have fared in the long vistas of time. We may quote from the original works when useful, convenient or necessary. But our main attitude in the presentation, will be rational. For though Faith is the foundation of life and belief, all men have not the privilege of sharing the Faith. But most seekers after Truth are expected to have the advantage of intelligence and discrimination. In reality most of our so called knowledge is based on faith, - Faith in things and ideas which we have not analysed or which elude analysis.

Evidence of the Senses

To believe in what is perceived by the senses has been a natural habit and instinctive urge with all beings. This is an instinct of the mind which is the *agent provocateur* of the senses. But the recording of the senses is even according to their own further-

only Omniscience on the part of its maker would make history reliable. The universe has existed from long long ago and the most ancient knowledge known as having been derived from the Omniscient is concentrated in the earliest human records which are known as the "*Veda*" or "Knowledge." The *Vedas* or the ancient reliable knowledge, have, as the most precious possession of the human race, been preserved by their special Preservers – the *Brahmanas* through a regular succession of technically perfect traditional learning. They bear all the hall-marks of origin from the Omniscient. They have come down from times immemorial; their language is 'Sanskrit' the most wonderfully perfect original language of the world; they have been preserved with all the sanctity and perseverance with which such divine knowledge should have been preserved. They contain or provide in entirety everything that is good in the later scriptures of the human race. Unfortunately many portions of the '*Vedas*' have been lost through aeons or ages of Time. But a good many portions of the *Vedas* have remained and it is especially fortunate that Veda Vyas Badarayana, the great Divine who rearranged the *Vedas* and had the Divine vision of Knowledge has left for human enlightenment the history of the universe very succinctly in the '*Puranas*'. The difficulty with the *Puranas* however is that like the narrations of one who knows the whole, they have blended in them physical, psychic and super-psychic events into one stupendous whole. Therefore while it is the most perfect history

available to men, it is very difficult to separate the various portions of the physical, the astral and the spiritual events and planes from one another. But they pre-eminently serve the great purpose of History, viz, enlightenment regarding the totality of the past. We shall therefore take occasionally some sidelights from these great works for our view of the eras about which mere speculation is but a wandering in darkness. We shall use the human materials according to our lights and the beaconlights of the past.

The *Modus Operandi* in this retrospect will be to take a bird's eyeview of principles and foundations, and how they have fared in the long vistas of time. We may quote from the original works when useful, convenient or necessary. But our main attitude in the presentation, will be rational. For though Faith is the foundation of life and belief, all men have not the privilege of sharing the Faith. But most seekers after Truth are expected to have the advantage of intelligence and discrimination. In reality most of our so called knowledge is based on faith, - Faith in things and ideas which we have not analysed or which elude analysis.

Evidence of the Senses

To believe in what is perceived by the senses has been a natural habit and instinctive urge with all beings. This is an instinct of the mind which is the *agent provocateur* of the senses. But the recording of the senses is even according to their own further

evidence always defective. Sometimes it is partial, sometimes it is wrong. We have several glaring instances of the defective results of perception. The most important of these is the dream, in which things appear and we seem to move and act without anything of the kind. I use this simple language in order that we may be as near the facts as possible. Some philosophers have, in the maze of technical words such as subjective, objective, apperception, and the like have jumbled up the ideas not only for others, but even for themselves, and have used language, in effect, for hiding rather than unveiling Truth. Then there is the instance of the mirage and the rainbow which appear without the presence there of water or variegated colours. Then there are the daily but mistaken perceptions of the large Sun appearing small, the stars disappearing by day and the trees appearing to move from a running train. Then again, we have everyday the miracle of not seeing the millions of germs around us and the eye not being able to see itself, nor things too near or too far. We have further instances of the unreliable nature of perception in hypnotic trance, Mesmeric visions and magic effects. Thus it can be definitely said that the results of perception are many times unreliable. They prove to be partial or wrong on better evidence or after the vision has passed away. Perception, therefore, by itself is not a reliable guide. Who knows when it will be falsified ? All habits of belief are not necessarily right. To believe in sense-knowledge or perception as the basis of knowledge is, therefore, a way to possible errors and mis-

conceptions. Science seems to know it very well and therefore insists upon testing the results again and again and changes its provisional conceptions from time to time. The ancient fore-fathers of the human race appear to have realized this weakness in taking perception as the basis of knowledge and they therefore valued it at its proper worth. For secondary and tentative matters, the judgement of the senses was utilised and for fundamental principles and realities they relied upon the Divine Knowledge. There is however an experience or knowledge beyond the senses and this was not negatived by them. I, for instance, do realise that, I exist, even when my eyes and ears are closed, and my senses of smell, taste and touch are absolutely dormant as in sleep. This experience is relied upon by the Perceiver, and it is, as we have said, reliable because it is undeniable. Some thinkers, to reconcile certain aspects, have imagined seven dimensions (time and space being amongst them) of all things perceived. But there is no need of being entangled in this labyrinth of dimensions, if we understand that sense perception is tolerable while it goes but cannot be the basis of finally reliable knowledge. The more deeply we think of the world, the more we see it as a phantasmagoria of the mind. The very conditions of a phantom are perceptible in all things of perception. We have therein uncertainty, unsteadiness, changeability, and variation with the perceiver.

Reasoning or Logic

Reason is a word of very uncertain meaning and so is the word rational. Logic deals with the realm of drawing deductions from premises and is said to be the art and science of reasoning. This reasoning also is not a very reliable commodity. Firstly because, it passes from the known to the unknown and therefore requires some basic 'knowns' *ab initio*; which implies a reliance on something obtained from elsewhere. Reason therefore is merely an intermediate helper in the process of developing knowledge after the basic data have been obtained or are taken for granted.

The chief instrument of reasoning is intellect, and the intellect is as fallible as the senses. It is liable to innumerable prejudices and prepossessions. It sometimes judges perversely on account of them. Then again it is dependent upon the data which it has received and upon the memory which distributes and reproduces that data. Further it gives different readings with different persons and even so with the same persons at different times. Usually what we call reasoning is an artifice or apotheosis in the art of self-deception. This will be perceived on observing the fact that so many of what are dubbed as conclusions of reason cannot be reduced to unchallengeable logical chain of syllogisms.

But we may examine even the syllogisms or the *modus operandi* of logic both deductive and inductive. The deductive logic bases itself on a *major premise*

which is a universal proposition which in conjunction with a *minor premise* or a particular proposition gives the conclusion. Now it is a matter of sportive challenge to this syllogism and well-known to logicians that the position is absolutely untenable under analysis. Let us for instance, take the well-known syllogism:—

All men are mortal.

Socrates is a man.

∴ Socrates is mortal.

Now, the conclusion, namely “Socrates is mortal” is either included in the universal proposition, “All men are mortal,” or it is not included therein. If it is included, then we get no further knowledge from this deductive process. Ours is merely an analysis of what we knew. If it is not included in the universal proposition, the proposition itself falls to the ground, because the expression “all men” would then be unwarranted.

Now let us consider the sphere of the so called Inductive Logic which is no new logic after all but merely a mode of generalization from particulars. This can be dismissed easily by the common-sense observation that any number of particulars cannot give a universal proposition. For our observations are limited by the limitations of our senses, our judgement and our lives. The very fact that science has been, from time to time, shifting its grounds from atoms to electrons, from theories to theories, from certainty to relativity and so on, is a living testimony to the changeability, uncertainty, variation, and unreli-

ability of the inductive process as a final determinant of knowledge.

These facts about the fundamental *impotence of logic* are not unknown to the logicians. And some of them have rightly observed that rationalism carried to its logical conclusion ends in disbelief of Reason itself. This disbelief in reasoning is but a reaction of an undeserved value given to reasoning. Reasoning is good in its own limited sphere when the basic facts and propositions are available; but by itself alone it cannot give reliable knowledge. Nor can it give absolutely reliable knowledge when joined to perception, in as much as all the unreliability of the data of perception would mar the value of its deductions.

Reason then is a good handmaid but a bad tyrant. It should not be given absolute power. It is also a good wrestler and can wrestle a good deal on your side provided you know how to feed it and make it strong in anticipation of fights. The usual artifice to bring an argumentative opponent to his knees is the well-known Socratic method, namely, asking him the connotation of his terms and denying him his first basic universal. Hence it is that people do not put much faith in argumentation. Representations from one side and the other can be multiplied *ad infinitum*. So also it is that the logic of life and the logic of facts are usually contrasted with the logic of the school-room and the ante-chamber.

The same position has been taken up by SHANKARA-CHARYA, the great expounder of Absolute Philosophy

and by Vyas in the *Brahma Sootras* (तर्कप्रतिष्ठानात्) The same suspicion of reason and its credentials led Kant to subdivide Reason, so to say, into plain, practical and applied. The present condition of philosophical thought which is speculation rather than philosophy is but a proof of the absolutely erratic nature of reasoning and its results.

Absolute Philosophy

We have noted before that such subjects as Absolute Reality can hardly be finally determined by the human intellect. But God in his infinite grace has given knowledge unto man. It is embodied in the earliest Revelation known to us. Absolute Reality must exist independent of time, space and circumstances. And absolute reality must naturally be always verifiable. If by analytical process we examine one thing after another we will find that all things which we perceive are changeable, or perishable or somehow affected by time, space and substance. None of these things therefore can be taken as absolute reality. The Perceiver, however, cannot be negated. He remains the same unchanged and unchangeable. Even *he* cannot deny himself, for his very denial confirms his existence. This perceiver has no other characteristic but *Existence*, *Vitality* and *Exuberance*. It is the irreducible minimum of Reality. It is the same as what we have called 'Atman' which is variously called as the Soul, the Spirit, God, or the Infinite Being.

“All this is verily ‘Brahman’; Nothing here is apart” says the Upanishad:

सर्वखल्विदं ब्रह्म नेह नानास्ति किंचन ।

“This Atman is Brahman the Infinite Being ”

अयमात्मा ब्रह्म ।

“That Supreme Being art thou, Oh Shwetaketu !

तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो ।

Thus the knower, or perceiver, the ‘Atman’ is the only reality; all else is but a vision – of the nature of a dream, mirage or reflected image.

This knowledge we may take as fundamental. It is precious because it is corroborated by Reason as well as by Revelation. This knowledge was believed in by innumerable saints and sages of the past. And it is believed in by the saints and sages of India to-day. It stands behind the Philosophy of the *Buddha*, which says that all is *naught* or ‘Shoonya.’ It is at the back of all faiths like Christianity, Islam and others which assert the futility of worldly existence and glorify the life in Heaven, – the ideal region of Godhead. It is partly represented in the Idealisms of Plato and Berkley and it is near the horizon of the Doctrine of Relativity and seven Dimensions of Science. We lay down the principle therefore that ‘Atman’ is the Absolute Reality: all else is visionary.

Ethics

The Problem of Ethics was simple in the ancient times. “What is right action or what is the way of

acting rightly?" – That is the Problem of Ethics. The ancients saw the uncertainty of reason and equivocations of the so called conscience, and they pinned their faith to the Divine Revelation or *Shastras* which derivatively mean the Divine Injunctions for the conduct of life. Thus it was, that Ethics became a part of Religion. Certainly, it was not the whole of religion; for, religion includes also the faith in and devotion to God, as well as to his Word.

This view of the source of authority in the conduct of life has continued from age to age to our own generation, though of late it has been much disturbed by the influence of disbelief. The message of the *Vedas* which are the principal *Shastras* was carried on by saints and prophets like Budhha, Jarathustra, Christ and Mahomet in the length and breadth of the world, through their religious paths and their faithful disciples. But later on, Materialists and Agnostics and Dissenters took unjust advantage of the differences of these later creeds and religious denominations. They have tried to show that moral standards are varying with different peoples and in different times; and therefore there is nothing like reliable moral standards. But the facts are just the other way. Even behind the variety there is the unity of principles. The differences are superficial in matters of details and they have usually been urged by the special conditions of the times, the countries, or the promoters.

We now come to the fundamental principles of morality. One fundamental principle is *Men are prone*

to Activity and Rest from activities is the goal of right ethical conduct. All morality is a progress on that road. This position is substantiated by several grounds. Firstly, as we have mentioned before, absolute knowledge points to the existence of one everlasting Entity. All else is but visionary: hence all labour on getting and avoiding things, creating and destroying objects, is ultimately and in the longer vision but waste and vanity. Secondly all activity is but a process of the expenditure or consumption of energy. Even physical life itself is a process of gradual exhaustion of the original momentum with the intermediate steps of growth and decay. And therefore the less the waste the longer the life. This view also shows the strength of the principle above enunciated. It was natural indeed, that with infinitely less waste of energy the ancients prolonged their life to long ages. Thirdly from the practical point of view we find that the labours and efforts of men and nations or peoples are either flimsy and negligible or end in smoke, war and misery, or consist in robbing, exploiting or tyrannizing over their own fellow-men. Thus we see that in the history of the last hundred and fifty years, the great impulse and artificial impact given to human activities has brought about untold misery to men and ruin to several nations. No amount of organisation nor revolution in the methods of production and distribution can bring real relief; for, the mischief lies at the core. The faith of people in Religion and God-given principles of action being on the wane and Satan or the Passion for possessing and rebelling having got the

better of man, activity misdirected and mischievous is a natural consequence. It does not matter that the result is retribution and ruin. The ordinary people are usually guided by what the bigger people do or aspire to. And thus when there is the 'treason' or 'the great betrayal' by the leaders themselves mankind suffers. Indeed this decline in the moral conditions of the human race as we shall hereafter see is not a matter for surprise except on false theories of evolution and progress. As we shall note hereafter it is a natural condition in the gradual process of natural exhaustion to which all organisms are prone. Fourthly, looking from the standpoint of organic life, it has been well-known that all this world is full of beings, large and small. Every action of ours, every movement even the process of breathing is wrought with an amount of injury to living beings; and therefore each lessening of activity means so much less of injury or loss to life. Lastly, looking at the subject from the point of view of eternity, or long vistas of time and space, and number of personalities, and looking simultaneously on the insignificance, futility and meagreness of human ambitions, is not all activity which is either a waste of our own energies or harmful to others or inconsequential to our fundamental happiness but a running after a will o' the wisp? The principle of rest (विश्राम or शान्ति) that has been fundamental to morality has, as we have observed, further aspects of vital consideration. It implies a way of conduct from lowermost point to the highest goal. It also implies that the progress of the pilgrim is naturally countable from the

point *where he is* and therefore what is progress to one may be retrogression to another. It further implies consequentially that the moral standards not only can differ but they must differ with different men and different strata of human society. For instance, the climax or meridian in point of sexual morality would be absolute abstinence for the whole life. But next to it, would come sex - relationship with only one individual all through life with absolute abstinence from even the idea of connection with any other. It is with the sanctity of religion that men confirm the the resolve to such a connection. There are also various stages of abstinence in relationship even with the one. This general principle of abstinence is also perceptible in Islam to the limitation of four wives. Then of course there are the numerous grades in moral standards down to the so called uncivilized tribes, which try to limit the propensity to the freedom of the sexes to a certain extent in their own ways. We may take another instance referring to what we call the principle of non-hurt or non-violence. In this there are various gradations beginning from the ascetic-yogis like Shankara, or Dadhichi who were ready to give up life merely for the asking, and Christ who sacrificed himself at the cross, down to those human beings who kill others for self or profit or power. There are the Brahmanas who are not to take up arms except under extraordinary circumstances. There are the Kshatriyas who have to take up arms only in defence of the higher ideals of men. And there are those who are ready to wage wars

on the call of the majority or the Dictator without discrimination of ways and means. There are in the manner of diet those who try to live without food or on fruits and roots alone. There are those who live on corn and vegetables produced by agriculture, and there are those who accept the meat of the fish, the fowl and the fauna. That individual or class is on the higher scale of morals (in that particular line), who abstains more from involving hurt to other beings of complex organic life

Thus then morality is the progressive control and curtailment of activity. Of course manifestly harmful activity is on the very face of it to be avoided; but it may be questioned whether activity for good ends is to be avoided, or what is often said to be '*duty*' is also unnecessary. It will be seen on deeper observation that even good ends are relative to certain preconceived ideas. For instance, fighting for one's own country implies a number of assumptions which will be plain to the student of philosophy, history and pacifism. As regards duties it may be noted that they arise from assuming responsibilities. Duties towards the wife, for instance, arise after entering into marriage, and towards the master after entering service. In fact on the theory which we have enunciated, there is no worldly aim to be achieved, the world itself being a phychic illusion.

But till we realise that it is an illusion, its troubles and sorrows whether real or otherwise affect us; further we would wish to reach that realisation -

that great enlightenment in which the pains and pleasures of the world may not affect our being. The way to this end which is a goal beyond the world is the only path to which we should apply ourselves. This path can be true and reliable only when it comes from the Omniscient. This path then is the path of Religion. Some people misunderstand this philosophy as leading to inaction and idleness. But they forget that men act under the urge or impetus of their constitution physical, sensual and mental. Certainly, cessation from worldly activity is the goal of spiritual life as it is the natural end of physical life also. "All activity arises" as the great law-giver Manu has said "from desires" and there is no better way to bring peace in the world for those who long for it, than the curtailment of human desire. It is the desires which bring in troubles, tyrannies and wars. It is indeed difficult to cut them off at a stroke and the various paths of religion therefore prescribe doses suitable to the various layers of society. The fundamental religion of the Vedas and the Smrities being meant for the whole human race, prescribes it by dividing men into four categories namely the virtuous, the virile, the producers and the rest.

From Restiveness to Restfulness

Now let us take it that our gradual progress in morals means the progress from restiveness to restfulness. But this principle is very general and

philosophical. We may enunciate another and a more practical principle of Ethics or Morality. Now, we know that there is the Atman or the living Spirit which pervades the whole world. This Atman works, or properly speaking, seems to work, through many minds and many senses, or as the ancient said, with thousands of heads, thousands of eyes and thousands of feet. In fact it works through the millions of beings of Creation. All the heads and hands, minds and mouths, feet and features, do belong really to Him. It is therefore that if I hurt you I feel the reaction in my own being. If I give you pleasure I feel the reaction of pleasure myself and so also I feel a similar reaction to all the actions which I voluntarily do. The highest law therefore of my life is and should be that I should not hurt any being by act, word or thought. It may be noted that this is as we have anticipated a *negative* rule. It is a fundamental rule from which others can be easily deduced. For instance, I should not tell an untruth because it will mislead and harm the man who takes it from me. I should not abuse anybody because it would hurt his feelings. The principle of non-hurt (अहिंसा) has also its positive side, viz. giving pleasure unto others or as we usually say doing good unto others. This 'doing good unto others' is considered a positive virtue by all religious paths. The plain reason is that it puts our mind in peace and pleasure with our Atman and thus tends to efface the distance consequent upon ignorance. It is the line of action prescribed by Word Divine for the very purpose, - not that we can change

the world's conditions by so doing but really we help our Self.

We have noted above that the world is a vision of the Atman. The question is why has the vision come into existence ? The Vedas give the clue to the explanation; and it is a very beautiful interpretation. The Atman, with all its joy and perfection and life is all alone; and loneliness is a bit tiresome. He is of course all-powerful. In fact the power has its existence in Him. This power he exercises for a little play. He wills: "I am one; may I be many." and He becomes many through the mind and its various ramifications, (एकोहं बहुस्याम् प्रजायेय इति) "May I multiply" and He multiplies. In this his play or sport or *leela* we have the whole creation. It is the play of a great playwright of a great conductor, a great scenerio. Hence it is gigantic, it is as good as real, its theatre is large, it is mighty in its issues. And yet it is a play, and withal the play has its own laws by which its actors or pawns come and go, live and die, enjoy and suffer. This may be called the Law of Karma - action and reaction. It pervades all spheres of the Universe, it is a physical law, sensual law, psychic law and a moral law. We partake of this inner *urge to be many* and to multiply. Just as men play till the original impulse to play is exhausted, so also on the exhaustion of the divine impulse the universe ceases to be: it goes out of existence. Looked at from this sportive point of view, the sport does not do any harm. The victory or defeat at a cricket-match of any one

side does not matter to the pure onlooker; one side may win or loose as well as the other. The pleasure is merely of the sight. The troubles arise with taking sides.

We may further note in this connection that in this grand play every item goes by rule and line. Because the original impact is Divine, the Law of Karma affects all Misery and happiness, joy and grief come as a result of past activities. Earthquakes and famines, and other catastrophes are also the resulting consequences of the past actions of individuals or groups. We see that there are times and places when men conjointly misbehave, or do evil, so also they may suffer conjointly. Even there, we perceive that all people do not suffer equally. Some escape with a scratch, and some are saved miraculously. It is our superficial thought, and due to emotional excitement, that men have complained against Divinity for the injustice of such catastrophes, wars, plagues and fires. In fact every such natural event is but a consequential happening. In reality it is no more accidental in the moral than in the physical world. It is in our ignorance of the totality of the facts, that we attribute injustice to the dispensation of Divinity. On exact examination every case shall be found to be but an illustration of the Law of Karma. Cases are well known in which men are unintentionally stopped from going and others are unexpectedly led into a railway train which runs for a disaster. These are not accidents; they are but a part of the whole design. Each

individual carries with him his own good and bad deeds, and in due course reaps their consequences. If he hurts others he himself is hurt in time, if he benefits others he is benefited in time. It may *not* be necessarily *in the same way* because the external ways and means do not matter. What matters is simply, mainly and unfailingly the action and reaction on the psychic plane.

Fundamentals of Morality

It may be said that there are four fundamental principles which form the basis of morality. They are Charity, Veracity, Austerity and Purity. Though they belong to the same group, they are practically different categories. Charity and Veracity affect the society especially, while Austerity and Purity more deeply affect the individual self, though all these being parts of the individual's moral behaviour interact upon one another. While the former couple is subtle and illusive, the latter is overt and practical. It is therefore that the practical influence of the latter is greater while the former usually escapes analysis. It is therefore also that the fundamental tenets of the original Religion lay great stress on Purity and Austerity. The Vedas and other Shastras attach great importance to the purity of descent, purity of food, and purity of contact. In fact all religious paths have laid great stress on Purity and Austerity, naturally because they lead up to Charity and Veracity in life.

A larger list of basic morals may be formed but

they will be found to be included in one or the other of these four categories. They constitute the sub-heads under the four. But the more important point is that all these four basic moral virtues are columns in which there may be various degrees. For instance, there can be numerous degrees in Purity or Charity. When we say that a thing or person is pure or impure, charitable or uncharitable we only mean that he is on a certain point in the scale of purity or charity. Even in Veracity some are on a higher scale and some on the lower scale than the others. The sum total or rather the joint *multiple* of the respective degrees of these four constitutes the moral value of an individual or a group and as the quantity is greater the moral value is greater. Character is such a result spread over a length of time. It is equally possible that there may be in an individual or a society a very high degree of one or the other of these four while the others may be disproportionately scanty. As a general rule, however, belonging as they do to a homogeneous whole, they are not found in great disproportion.

Then there is another and fundamental consideration in deciding moral values. It is the quality of action. An action as well as an individual's mentality may be of three kinds. It may be either *sāttvic* or *rājas* or *tāmas* in its quality. The *sāttvic* is purely good, the *rājas* is mainly designing, while the *tāmas* is predominantly intoxicating, and darkening Charity for instance may be pure charity without self-interest

or it may be designing charity for selfish purposes or it may be charity just to the wrong person in the wrong way. The moral value is to be assessed accordingly. And the reward, retribution or reaction is of a simillar nature.

It will be seen from the above that the fundamental basis of morals is peace, rest, or gradual elimination of wasteful activity, in order that the individual may disentangle himself from the meshes of this visionary existence; that the visionary existence being but a counter-part of the self, each action of the self is followed in course of time by a consequent reaction and that the whole panorama of Universe is but a visionary game of action and reaction following the impluse of the Atman, the Spirit Divine. The origin of the seeming evil is to be sought in the triple nature of the original impluse which embodies the good, the dusty and the dark. Above all it is to be remembered that the good, the indifferent and the evil are all reactions of the mental or psychic phases.

The Complex Universe

The Universe is as wonderful as the great source from which it emanates. It is not the same or similar in all eyes. It bears all the marks of the hat-t ick. It is wonderful, it is unaccountable, it is uncertain. It is unexpected, it is incomprehensible, it is lifelike. It is, in fact, the magic of the great Magician. All those who try to measure it in its totality are all the more amazed at its impregnability.

Is the universe true or false ? Is it a substance or only a vision ? Is it subjective or objective, as some people would say ? We have answered this question in the foregoing remarks on philosophy. Let us take it both as subjective and objective for our present purposes. It is subjective to the Atman. It is objective to the Individual. It has a subjective existence with reference to the all-pervading Atman while to individual it seems to have an objective existence. This universe of course emanates from the one great Source, which may be called Atman or Brahman. Whether it be as a subjective reality or an objective reality, at any rate, it is wonderfully designed and ordered. For our practical purposes we may lay down some of its prominent features. We need not examine here the attitudes of the disbeliever and dissenter for such attitudes are usual in minds which are not able to see much beyond themselves or their little circles.

Principle of Vikriti

The first principle that rules the Universe is the principle of '*Vikriti*' a word for which there is hardly any term in the English language. It comes from the root *Kri* (to do, act, or create) with the addition of the suffix '*Vi*' connoting disjunction, distinction, opposition and intensity; and it partakes of the features of all these. Its one prevailing phase is of course activity or movement. This movement or activation, in some phases takes the form of separation or disjunction, in some that of intensity, in some of distinction, and in some of opposition. From another point

of view we may describe the process as one of *gradual exhaustion by action*, embodying beginning, development, aging, and extinction. We see all these phases in organic life and the universe is also one great organism. The analogy of man and the universe, with the microcosm with the macrocosm is very suitable to our purpose. The normal man is born, he assimilates things, grows more complex, vivacious and artful, then declines in capacity, wears away and dies. Such has been also the history of the Universe. In the earlier stages, its personalities or substances merely existed in the purity of almost immaculate life. Then came the development in which there was multiplication of entities through sub-division, or in other words the starry spheres as well as terrestrial beings multiplied by the disintegration of the original vital substance. Then came period of intensity in emotions, activity and arts. And lastly set in as a result of the consequent exhaustion, deterioration and decay. The vital powers of the first period were centred in righteous activity; In the second they were turned towards knowledge; in the third towards devotion; and in the fourth towards strife. The first period being without any corrosion lasted longest. The second, third, and fourth decreased in regular proportion in length of the time-scale. The Purāṇas which are the representatives of traditional history both in the physical and the cosmic spheres, point out the time ratio of these four periods as four, three, two and one, naming them as *Sat*, *Tretā*, *Dvāpar*, and *Kali Yugas* or ages. It is very remarkable how the periods of these various ages have

been calculated. The above time-units added together give ten units or one multi-unit and the great cycle of time is built up into a thousand multi-units giving us the symbolic figure of one with three zeroes. One is the only positive figure, the rest are zeroes; and yet the zeroes attain a wonderful multiplication value through the preceeding Unit. Universe is the three zeroes (*Unus*: one, *Verto*: I turn) turning round the one which is the indivisible basis giving value to the zeroes. If the zeroes follow it they become valuable. If they presume to go before it, they become nonentities without any value.

The principle of *Vikṛiti* or *Vikāra*, then, is the working principle of the Universe, which rises, ripens and decays As historical tradition shows we are in the fourth age, the Age of Strife. This seems to be very probable as well as amenable to experience. The first age was naturally pure and righteous as is the unsophisticated child The next age being near to the righteous gloried in defending the righteous. In that age we had a line of noble vindicators of virtue like Rama, Sita, Nala and Damayanti. Then there came an age which ended about five thousand years ago with the war of the Mahabharata, showing us the strange admixtures of the virile personalities of Bhishma, Bheema, Karna, and Duryodhana - neither absolutely virtuous nor absolutely fallen, and along with them the divine personality of Shree Krishna with whose passing away the present age set in.

Origin of Species

The whole mankind, as the ancients have recorded, came from common ancestry, several millenniums ago. Scientific men have made conjectures as regards the origin of men and the origin of beings, and they also appear to think that perhaps hundreds of thousands of years have gone after their origin. In matters so remote from our own times, it is vain and futile if not misleading to speculate from the present data and to create a smok-screen of speculation. The physical conditions must then have been quite different and even the astronomical conditions may not be the same. It seems from the traditional testimony of the ancient sages and saints that the first entities that came into being were almost divine in their physical, intellectual and spiritual powers. From them came the various species of beings under various conditions and circumstances under varied impulses, impacts, and contacts. It was later that the usual sexual mode of reproduction came into being. It is well-known that even now there are asexual modes of reproduction among certain classes of beings. Whatever it may be, we can take it that human beings came into existence hundreds of centuries ago, and that the various races which seem to be different belonged originally to one stock which has undergone variations of form, features and colours, on account of variations of physical, mental and spiritual conditions.

Common Human Ancestry

Besides the testimony of ancient records there are several manifest pieces of evidence which lead us to the same conclusion. The first and foremost data suggesting a common original stock of the human race is the constitution of numerals. The primary numbers are ten amongst all human races. The beginning is from zero. It proceeds upto nine and then there is the one again with the zero. The zero is the absence of the universal phenomena and is rightly symbolised amongst all human races by the primordial point or circle. Then the *one* comes into existence and the manifestation begins. The one sprouts forth into two viz, the spirit *He* and the power *She*. Then come the three fundamental attributes viz, the attribute of existence, the attribute of lust, and the attribute of dullness and decay. Then proceed into being the four mental faculties: the mind, the intellect, the imagination and the egoism. And then come into being the five primal elements ether, air, heat, water and earth and the various phenomena of the Universe. This is only by the way.

Then there are the similarities of language, of expression and of calendar calculation which point also to an identity of origin. There are seven days of the week, and their names signify reference to the same deities, planets or entities. It may even be said that the whole culture radiated from the original stock of the human race; for, it will be seen that

Medicine, Astrology and Grammar have so much in common and can be traced to a common source.

First Habitat of Man

Now the next point of inquiry is what was the place where this original stock of human race first developed. It seems very probable that even if under the nebular theory, this our world cooled down from a radiating mass, its highest cooling point was in India in the Himalayas. It also seems probable that the first development of the human stock must have taken place not in the long sun-bereft regions of the poles, but in those of temperate climate near the Equator. Thus taking the highest portions and equatorial proximity as the natural places most suitable for this original development, we are lead to conclude in line with the ancient records that the prime stock of the human race developed in India near the Himalayas; and it developed more and more in the plateaus of the Punjab and the fertile plains surrounding the Gangetic valleys.

There is one more very important fact which leads us to the same conclusion. It is the religious data. Vedic religion, as founded on the Revelation of God unto man, is the most ancient Religion. Further it bears all the marks of the original article. It bears no name, it is simply spoken of as Dharma the uplifter, the upholder, the upraising path. It holds the man up from his natural tendency to go down into annihilation. Further its Revelation is not attributed to one

man, but to a range of *Rishies* or saints and sages; and yet it is believed, understood and realised as one integral whole. This religion has not the hide-bound, hard and fast rules, betokening a human mind's limitations. It presents the light of religion in all its immensity, variety and unfathomableness. It excludes nobody, much less groups, races or communities. It scoffs at no beliefs or disbeliefs. The first disbeliever is but a disciple to the *Rishies* of the Vedas. For, no warring creeds, no tricky teachers, no tempting falsehoods then existed. The disbeliever was not the miseducated man, he was the man whose belief amounted to zero. He asked for light, and light was given unto him by the *Rishies* whom selfishness and falsehood were unknown. These Vedas were the primordial divine religious light of the universe. This light radiated through various saints, sages and prophets in the various parts of the world. And hence we find the similarity in the cultural values of the world.

Creation of Man

We have said before that *Vikriti* and not Evolution in the moral implications of the term, is the law of the Universe. *Vikāra* or *Vikriti* points to deterioration, exhaustion, decline and decay, while under the theory of Evolution things and persons are supposed to be taking the reverse course. From the scientific point of view, Life itself is a process of exhaustion. The flowers decay, animals grow old, and stones lose in size. This is all well-known, and it would be difficult to understand the version of the Evolutionist if we did not know that it

received its birth from the prejudices broadcast by atheists and agnostics, and was sub-consciously picked up by scientists and applied to research. In reality, the explanation of facts on the principle of *Vikāra* is scientifically far more convincing and in line with Nature. The theory about man rising from the ape is not only absurd and untenable but it is so palpably transparent in its ulterior motives that it will soon die out a natural death. The resemblance of the skeleton of a monkey with that of a man hardly proves anything, to a man who knows even a bit of logic. To deduce therefrom that the one came from the other is as absurd as to say that one mountain came from the other because they appear to be similar, or to say that the nim-tree in my compound came from a similar tree in my friend's garden because both are so strikingly similar. The jump from similarity to sameness in species is rather big. At the most it may be deduced that in the atomic or molecular combination of the two, there may have been some similarities as well as some differences. Indeed, thus do varieties come into existence. But that is no reason for saying that one species came out of the other. All the species may be different and collateral creations under various conditions from varied atomic combinations by primeval design. In fact, what we should clearly understand is that all these speculations into might-have-beens in these fields are either vain and useless, designing and intentional, or mischievous and misleading. There can be no tentatively reliable belief in these matters except through faith in the ancient records of tradition.

Deterioration of Man

Further, we have the historical testimony of the trend of Moral Deterioration in the annals of human history. We have already referred to the moral values and pointed out four of them, viz, Veracity, Charity, Austerity, and Purity, as the basic moral values. In the capital of these moral values there has been a definite decline, as can be seen from looking at the world's history and literature. The Rāmāyana gives the highest ideals of life in every relation of human affairs. The Mahābhārata stands next with its slight admixtures. Homer's Iliad stands still further down with its tempting heroine; still further in the scale stand the later epics as of the protestant Milton whose Satan is more interesting and lifelike than Jesus Christ. Besides we find that as time progresses crimes have increased, life has been more hypocritical, and wars have grown more frequent, more cruel and more treacherous. So, on all these moral counts men are not growing better but their moral strength is gradually decreasing. Some people have tried to make out that the ancient times were more barbarous. But facts and findings show that in India, the cradle of the human race, the highest form of culture has existed from the most remote times. It is only the glamour of arts and manufactures which has dazzled some people in thinking very complacently of our own age. Really speaking these arts and manufactures have sprung up from the intense lust for making money. In fact, as Rousseau and Tolstoy have point out, many of the so called arts and manufactures spring from and abet the worst elements

in human nature. They spring from avarice and abet sensuous luxury. Nay some of these arts and manufactures are pursued and produced not only to exploit men but to kill them unawares and *en masse*. We point to these things for the presentation of facts. We need be neither very pessimistic nor optimistic in these matters. By the natural law which we have already mentioned the centripetal forces drawing Man towards the Soul Supreme are lessening as the cycle of time revolves, and the centrifugal forces drawing men away from the real self are bound to increase. Only, we should know where we are, so that we may have a proper perspective.

Mid-summer-Night's Dream

The one great cause why people feel their own theories to be good, let us again point out, lies in the fact that the existence of the Universe is but visionary, and when a thing is visionary, the Visualiser thinks and feels his own interpretation as true and there is hardly any way to persuade him otherwise. It is therefore also that nothing can be proved but it is equally true that nothing can be disproved. The Universe is a Mid-summer Night's Dream. It is Much Ado about Nothing. It is often a Tempest. Its interpretation is As You Like It. It is merely a Winter's Tale.

The State

The Origin of the State is not lost, though it belongs to hoary antiquity. Manu has pointed out that the King came into existence through divine ordaining when people in a state of anarchy were troubled by various

kinds of terrors. This King was provided with the symbolic Staff of Sovereignty which carried with it the light of Brahman and the uplifting Path Divine for the protection of all created beings. Thus the king's status, function, duty and responsibility came from the Disposer of all events. His status was derived from the great Providence. His function was to protect all creatures. His duty was to act according to the Law Divine. And his responsibility was to wield the staff of sovereignty in accordance with the light of God. He had to do all these and he was the representative of the divine *because* he did so. That was why he was honoured and obeyed, and all men rendered unto him their tributes. It is a matter of historical record that there were kings like Rāma, Nala, and Yudhishtira who fulfilled these expectations living upto the great Ideals. And there are also some instances of kings, though rare, like Vena and Kansa who transgressed those ideals at their own peril. It is notorious however how after the death of king Vena in a tragic revolution, the people suffered from infinite troubles and horrors from those who had taken to loot, plunder, and atrocities systematized or otherwise. Nor is the recent history wanting in instances of the kind. A *regime* of terror followed the French revolution of 1789 and ended only when the great Napoleon reestablished the sovereignty. The same thing on a smaller scale happened when after the execution of King Charles I in England, Cromwell at the point of the bayonet purged the House of Parliament which had paraded its authority in beheading the King. The more modern tales of atrocities in Russia and Germany need no recapitulation. But that does not

exhaust the whole truth regarding the mischief of a state without a monarch, or under autocratic constitution. In these days the state itself in absence of the proper ideal has become an exploiter of the people on a huge scale. It is an autocracy of a kind. Men are being taxed and restrained to a degree before which the ship-money of old England would seem like a fly in a jungle of rapacious creatures. Crime has multiplied beyond all counts and its best samples have been found in the streets of New York and Paris. Of course men run the show as best as they can, under the circumstances. Whatever of good there is, is on account of and by reason of the atmosphere of religion and it is all in spite of the mischievous influences of men's evil propensities. It is due to the great and noble impulses furthered by the apostles of God, like Christ and other prototypes of Divinity, that Europe and America have till now been saved from being engulfed in the jaws of barbarism which would make a mockery of virtue, religion and all which makes the human life worth living.

The Mischief of Democracy

We need hardly point out that Religious Monarchy used to continue in some form for milleniums almost everywhere in the world. And the continuance of easy and moderate conditions in the ancient world must, in part, be traced to that circumstance. The mischief of democracy in its modern interpretation began only since the French Revolution and during a short space of about a century and a half, it has made a mess in the whole world. It has brought down catastrophes. It has dis-

ordered social life and it has demolished long-established moral values. And this is but natural, because it has been based on blatant falsehoods. There is no denying the fact, and the fact was never denied, that the government is for the people but when it is said that it should be by the people, that it should be determined by the majority votes of the people and that the elected men truly represent the people, the foundations are false. Firstly men have different wills, different opinions, and different interests. To expect that their joint opinion through the ballot-box will be in the interest of all is an error of the first magnitude. The reasons why the people cannot in this way properly govern themselves are plain. They have their own prepossessions, prejudices, limitations, hobbies and weaknesses, which run counter to the general good of the community. Secondly the majority is always on the sliding scale of morals and ideals. It is only the few, a very small minority that conform to the high standards of virtue, morality and character. It is but natural therefore that the people in general are easily led away into agreement with the proposals which go their way and to side with men who are for promoting the easy-going kind of life resulting from want of self-control and from the free play of passions. Thus the basis of democratic sovereignty is demoralising or degenerating. Then again it must be observed that one man cannot represent another in all matters nor completely. Democracy has a tendency in course of time towards totalitarianism and the tendency is all the greater as the religious influences decline or in mutual envy and jealousy nullify

themselves. The State in a democracy therefore becomes stronger and it tends to make man more and more a slave to the state rather than a worker for the happiness and peace of his Soul and Society. There is a tendency to make him a part of the machine and to squeeze out of him as much as the State can. He ceases to be his own master in proportion to the push of the government which constitutes the democracy. In fact, the pinning himself down in advance to what the majority will determine is a major token of absolute slavery and surrender of any fixed principles whatsoever. It is a state of mind to which no cultured part of humanity has subscribed till now and yet that is the inescapable implication and conclusion of democracy. People under modern so called democracies have not reached that state because they are instinctively against its ultimate tyrannies and pretending to be democratic spare themselves from being really so.

Its False Basis

But the basic falsehood of democracy is still more far-reaching. Democracy takes it for granted, though there is nothing to vouch for it in the theory itself, that the value of one vote is equal to the other, implying that all men are equal. Now there can be hardly a more palpable misstatement than to say that "all men are equal." In fact the absurdity of it is so patent, men are so unequal in their physical, mental, moral, and spiritual inceptions and attainments that this, that and the other round-about interpretation is put on it, to beguile men into its belief. The momentum of religion in behalf of charity,

philanthropy and brotherhood is misused for the purposes of a political theory which would naturally bring men of the wrong type to the front. It is this falsehood which lends its support to the belief that the decision of fifty one is right and proper and must hold good against the decision of forty-nine on the other side. Democracy is perhaps a part of a dynamical theory of politics and state, in which neither principles nor moral values nor spiritual interests nor perennial ideals have any static hold. The state, instead of remaining the protector of the people for living under God-given ideals transforms itself into a contractor of men's lives. When the people themselves become sovereign and become the makers of war and peace the reasons for not attacking the civil population evaporate into thin air. The nation becomes responsible for the war and naturally also for winning the war. War instead of being a major factor of the people's concern for the time being, comes with its full responsibility to the people. It becomes bitter, more pressing and more uncompromising, and spreads over a wider area of human beings. The indirect effect of these phases on the people's morals are too well-known to need reiteration. Democracy receives its vitality from passions and it abets also the worst passions in human nature. What else can we hope for from a theory of politics which is based on the falsehood of equality of all men and the weaker but subtler falsehoods that one man can properly represent several hundreds of men, and that the verdict of a casual majority should form the law of the State.

The Lure of Democracy

The strength of democracy lies in the very ambiguity of its connotations and implications. The gullible man in the street thinks that by getting a vote in democracy he is one of its masters, though the real masters are the managers who by clique or craft, by temptation or coercion, manage to keep majority in their hands. Democracy, as has been said, is an opiate which intoxicates the people and benumbs them or, more correctly, gags them. Another reason why democracy has been so much in the air is that it lays open a vast field of ambition to men who may be good, bad or indifferent. The cleverer the man in simulation and dissimulation the better are his chances in a democracy. He must have a strong clique, wide nets and a sweet tongue. There are plenty of instances in modern history illustrating the success of such men and of those whose character was the least of their qualifications. Then there is a third circumstance which acts widely in favour of democracy and this is the patronage, economic and social, that it wields through its enlarged machinery. It increases several times over, the expenses of a monarchist state and it squeezes out multifold taxes from the people, claiming to give amenities, education, health, and what not to the people. It spends and spends and keeps the tongue of money-grabbers and exploiters always moistening. Democracy keeps up a show of liberty by such institutions as jury and the like. But it enslaves men all the more through its machinery of ever-changing statutes in almost all departments of life. Thus democracy is seemingly popular on account of its temptations

which really make the state weaker and more prone to vice and crime,—more dangerous in war and more unscrupulous in peace.

Dictatorship: Nemesis of Democracy

Of late an antithesis has been made out between democracy and dictatorship on account of the slogan-exigencies of the Great War now raging. In fact not only the British Empire is a Monarchy but since the advent of Russia on the side of the Allies the slogan can hardly hold ground. It seems that dictatorship is the ultimate consequence and bitter Nemesis of democracy. It occurs when the whole people vote for one great man. It is furthered when there is a crisis supposed or real. Even ordinary representative governments have to return to it in such times of crisis;—the difference being only of presentation. Democracy and Dictatorship are both bad, one is a chronic, the other an acute disease. Did not Europe's numerous modern dictatorships spring up after democracies had their run? Does not the Dictator come into existence with the sublimated vote of the democratic machine? If the people are sovereign and they will that they shall have one leader how can you deny it to them? The real antithesis is not between Democracy and Dictatorship, it is between Government by God's 'Rule and Line' and Government by the 'Rule and Line' of dominating Human passions. And the rule by changing men and changing passions obviously implies negation of fixed principles or ideals.

Monarchy Vs. Dictatorship

As facts really stand, dictatorship is not hereditary

monarchy nor is hereditary monarchy dictatorship. The religious monarchy which we have envisaged is far away both from democracy and dictatorship. A dictator is really the president of democracy, risen by all its common arts and artifices, with the advantage of being invested with absolute powers by an enamoured people. He cannot have the advantages of a hereditary sovereign. He cannot have that levelised ambition. He cannot have that studied culture which is imparted to or is usually natural to a hereditary sovereign. It is amusing to hear of 'British Democracy'. Really speaking British constitution is a religious Monarchy helped by the nobility, the clergy, the press and the people of the country to good government.

Of course the wider truth is that the government is good, bad, or indifferent, according as the men who govern are good, bad or indifferent. If all men chosen for government in a democracy were good, and informed we should not be afraid of the results. But there is the rub. The tendency is just the other way and therefore we have inveighed more against it. It is easier to improve, influence, or even to remove a monarch. But it is impossible to do the like with a whole people counted by millions. A democracy going wrong has only two trap-doors of escape, one into the realms of dictatorship and the other into the realms of annihilation. Perhaps we may even say from this point of view that the worst monarchy is better than the best democracy in an absolute sense. For, there is an easy way out of a bad monarch but the best democracy always involves the tyranny of the majority. It is a different matter that the minority

thinking themselves helpless, yield to majority, or take their tyranny as the inevitable.

Liberty and Society

We may here again point out that the state is for the people, and it must protect the interests of the people. It is all the more necessary that for safeguarding and advancing the interests of the people, the sovereign power must be different from, and above the parties of the people. And in this connection another aspect of the interest of the people deserves consideration. The line of thought which we have followed assumes society with ideals and ends, and regards the State as the protector, defender and promoter of such a society. The state being more or less a material and physical embodiment of the power over or of the people, it does not and cannot arrogate to itself the function of determining or dictating, much less revolutionising, the ideals of the society for whose protection it came into existence. If the state has no right to dictate, much less has a majority the right to dictate, in the matter of ideals, to a society. Thus we come to the voluntary spiritual brotherhoods with loyalties to particular sets of ideals by which people bind themselves. These we call religious communities; and each Religious Community with a faith in a particular set of ideals divinely received, must be regarded as an integral society whose abiding interests, ideals and institutions the state should consider its duty to safeguard and promote. Instead of protecting these abiding interests, if the government disregards them and leaves the communities to drift for themselves or on the other hand chalks out other ways and means for

people's regimentation which would destroy those ideals and societies, it fails in its function and is bound in course of time to reach its Nemesis. So then, the principle we enunciate in politics for a state is: the State for the People, not People for the State, the Society for a divine Ideal, not for the experiments of the State.

From the principle that we have enunciated it would be clear that, having functions and duties of protecting the people in their own ideals, the sovereign must be one in line with the people. A foreigner to the country or the ideals or the society would hardly be able to fulfil the functions, duties and responsibilities of his position and when such an anomaly occurs there is either rebellion, revolution, and disorder or destruction of the people's ideals, culture and social organisms. Such things have happened in India with consequences which are but too apparent. But the minimum protection of human rights that even a foreign government can provide for the subjects is the protection of the cultural and religious rights. It is also the interest of the state to allow men to follow their religious loyalties because it is in religious faith that lie the roots of order and morality; and a government whose subjects or peoples have lost their moral back-bone soon falls to pieces like a house of cards.

Liberty and the State

In speaking about the State and Government one notion has been usually in the fore-front in modern times. It is the notion of liberty. This notion of liberty in its peculiar modern import is a sister-notion to democracy.

It was hatched in the days of the French Revolution, though the egg was laid when Protestants raised their revolt against orthodox Christianity. We are told that the great apostle of Puritanism gave up his oath of celibacy and entered into marriage after his defalcation from the church. This is a very small matter in itself but it shows where the wind was blowing. Great movements are indeed led by men with great potencies and some spiritual powers, but their weaknesses tell, and affect very bitterly the interests of the people. This liberty has been a red rag with some, it has been a riddle with others and with many it has been a very convenient key to licence. Theories have been started which make liberty as unknowable as it is unknown. I am said to have a right to complete liberty in consonance with or as compatible with the liberty of others and so also all the other individuals are supposed to have complete liberty compatible with that of all the others. This is a vicious circle which gives us no meaning out of Liberty. The doctrine of liberty becomes all the more dangerous when intellectuals combine in destroying all moral values and allow passions and power to be the sole motives to human activity. It has been rightly pointed out that no one in the long line of political philosophers has succeeded in analysing the liberty clearly and that "liberty is an empty concept lacking significant content." Liberty in abstract being rather a difficult commodity to define and in practice a dangerous commodity to distribute, it has been variously qualified and interpreted to signify different things, just like an arbitrary but convenient cipher. Some times freedom of a country from foreigners' control is

meant by liberty and sometimes to speak or act as one likes against the constituted government is spoken of as liberty, while sometimes the word liberty is loosely used for all kinds of licences against filial duties, moral control and matrimonial conditioning of conduct. Properly speaking the problem of liberty can be cut short very easily. Man is and should be at liberty to do the *right* thing; he is not and should not be at liberty to do the *wrong* thing. And as regards what is right and what is wrong the arbiter is the Religious Revelation to which he owes his allegiance or the State itself if he believes in none. In the latter case the State would be justified in applying to him whatever law it thinks fit in the interest of all citizens. In connection with the doctrines of liberty we have the notion of '*rights*'; and politicians have played ducks and drakes even with this word which has been deprived of its straight connotation. That which is *right* for me is *my right*. It is that which is proper for me to do but the word is used in just the reverse way. My right means, now, what is proper for other people to do unto me. I am inclined to laugh at the absurdity of the matamorphosis

Other Functions of the State

There are, of course, the miscellaneous functions of the State such as dispensation of justice, protection from internal aggression, supplying of the necessary amenities of public life etc. All these however are tissues and marrow or limbs arising or developing from one fundamental embryonic idea which we have enunciated. Then there is an allied problem of the details of the constitution.

As regards this the attitude of the ancient sages and saints has been that the king should be not only bound up constitutionly by the Divine Laws believed in by the people, but he should also by the unwritten laws of the constitution be amenable to the advice of the saints and sages honoured by the people. Then further, the government may be divided into eight functions presided over by eight ministries. The state can claim no more than one sixth of the produce of the land; and the income derived therefrom should form a natural safety-valve to the normal expenditure of the state. It follows that the state is not to exploit the people under the multifarious excuses of providing amenities, facilities and conveniences. The state should not only be debbarred from being the exploiter of the people, but it should also be stopped from providing facilities by law and otherwise for the exploitation of the people. Its end should be the happiness, contentment and prosperity of the people through the observance of their respective religious Laws of Life. Having its very basis in the ideals set forth by religion the state that goes counter to them in its implications or applications goes counter to the very reasons of its existence. For animals that would go by their own instincts and passions no state is necessary but the state of Nature. It is only for the proper ideals of men that the State came into existence under the Divine impulse, under Divine dispensation and under the Divine Law.

Fundamentals in Politics

So then in politics the fundamental problem is not the number of those who govern but the quality of those

who are to govern. Abstract liberty is not the aim for which the State is constituted but the aim and function of the State is to protect the people in the pursuit of divinely ordained ideals. For the protection and ordered continuity of such ideals monarchy is most suitable; and for the best training of the monarch and for the purity of the race it is necessary that monarchy should be hereditary. Any other constitution however tempting for the time being or to persons who seek power, is void of the mark. It is bound, in course of time, to lead to the destruction of the rulers and the ruled, which is the retribution of transgressing the traditions and the intimations of Nature. The universe is a monarchy, the family is a monarchy and the state in order to be well-governed ought to be a Monarchy. Otherwise one-man-rule will come with a vengeance.

Confusion Worse Confounded

When we are reading books that count, we are almost confused with the variety, not to say the clashes of views, ideas and opinions we find around us. It is the same enigma that appears to stare us in the face when we see men and facts and phenomena around us. The differences are not the less accentuated in their interpretations. Perhaps the world is the same old good and bad world that it was. The canvas and the colours are the same. It is perhaps the same Talkie House with the same actors playing different roles in different plays with like denouements. But it does not satisfy us. There's the rub. We all complain that it is not satisfactory though we are passing time, -perhaps because we cannot help

doing so. Or, to take another metaphor, we strut our way accross the stage and make our exits. We choose to make ourselves believe that we have played our part but we feel we have somewhere bungled. Perhaps it is not *we* that have bungled. But somebodies have, and we are their paws or pawns. It would be as difficult to change the whole world around us as to transform the planets of our solar system. I have often felt the keenness with which people are fumbling for finding out new truths and solutions. The great assiduity is due perhaps not so much to the love of philosophic research but to practical considerations of the world in which they live. All the sundry thinkers and feelers seem to agree that the world is badly in need of repairs. The Imperialist, the democrat, the communist, the anarchist and the representatives of almost all so called *isms*, however much they differ in their prescriptions are agreed that the present condition of mankind is not good, is bad and serious.

The Light of India

When we speak of India as a Saviour we are speaking of a country which is the cradle of the human race, which is the home of Man's Primordial Religion, which is the conservator of the Vedas and the Sanskrit language. Whose country it is? I should say, nobody's, in one sense, and everybody's in another. It is God's country and it is theirs who are His. In India all ideologies decompose. It is the seat of unadulterated truths and hence it is that intellectuals come to India and will come to India for light and learning. India is the home of the human race and fundamental truths.

There is one thing remarkable about India and it is that India is a land of surprises. Not only, it is a land of many peoples, many languages, many cultures, and many seasons, but its history, its mentality, its philosophy of life are unique and original. Some men have been wondering what queer people these Indians are ! They have lived and keep on living since the dawn of history. They do not care to convert others or to increase their crowd. They are not dismayed by differences. They are not undone by misfortunes. They are not dumb-founded by catastrophes. They are not wonder-struck at science. They do not care to exhibit their cultural wares. Nay they hide them as if they were their Shibboleth. They grow strong with time. Nations have gone to them for plunder or power or prestige. Preceptors and prophets have carried learning and religion from them for general use. Everywhere else new things and new doctrines get the better of the field but with these people old things reassert themselves. They are conservative by instinct and grow more so by conviction. Men wonder how their princes preferred forests to palaces, how their women preferred seclusion to sauntering for having good time, how their learned classes preferred penury to power and palaces, and how their society worships ascetism and self-sacrific rather than self-interest and the almighty dollar. The key to this riddle is simple There is an immense power in the way that they have followed. What Indian light and symbolism can achieve even to-day has been shown by the lightening hyroglyphics of modern times. The symbolism of the Swastika and the value of the ideals

of ascetism, vegetarianism, and abstinence, have made their mark even on the doubting Thomases of to-day. But there is the great clap-trap. The secrets of the ancients, impart power but they do not countenance its abuse. The mighty Rāvana became powerful by the very offices of austerity and devotion but he invited his ruin by lust and misuse of that power. So, to have power, prosperity, peace and philanthropy simultaneously is rather a difficult job which demands more than our usual human intellect and human ambitions. The people of India, at any rate their men of light and leading, realised this and they chose the narrow path of conserving and following the ancient wisdom. They realized that the only way to happiness, progress and peace was not that of more money, more territory or more machines, but it was the *good* life all round, proper ordering of society and the stabilizing of religion and its values.

Conservatism

I need hardly say that Conservatism, involving practically a philosophy of life, can hardly be dealt with exhaustively in a work of this nature. In fact it would be proper to say that for exhaustive treatment of the principles, practices, applications and consequences of conservatism we can point only at the Sacred books of the human race. And if I succeed even in pointing once again at these great heritages as the ever-living sources of the wisdom that we need, my task shall have been greatly achieved. My work has not been much like that of a painter who dashes out wonderful out-lines and wonderful colours in presenting a picture; my work is of the

nature of a sculptor who finds before him an oblong log of marble and begins removing portions after portions by his chisel, to uncover the ideal image of the heart.

Conservatism is like all complex notions and psychic characteristics, difficult to define. The attitude of a conservative is to conserve the best in life as contrasted with the attitude of a libertine to waste it away. Conservatism implies two things viz. that there *is* something which deserves to be conserved and that we desire to conserve it. We use conservatism in the general sense of an attitude or desire of conserving the best heritages of the human race. We say by implication that mankind has had a very precious heritage, that the heritage has come down to us as a divine legacy of ideals, religion and culture; that these things are too precious to be lost; that it is in our interest to preserve and follow them; that we are bound to conserve them in all their purity and integrity as trustees of posterity. In a sense conservatism is imbedded in human nature. We are all conservatives or would-be conservatives except for ignorance or short-sightedness. Conservation of Vitality is a principle, not dearer to Nature than to Man and it is not dearer to Man than to Society. Society always cherishes and wishes to conserve the best in its life, that which is of the essence of its greatness, goodness and purity. Conservatism is really not in antithesis with liberality. A conservative is opposed in a general sense to a wrecker or breaker who is for wrecking the ideals or breaking away from them, which is much the same. Real conservatism is always allied with the ancient noble ideals of life. Hence we find conservative

liberals like Vyāsa and Vālmiki, Dante and Napoleon Burke and Carlyle. Thus the natural antithesis to conservatism is revolt; and protestantism is a half-way house to revolt. Thus it usually happens that protestantism leads the way to revolution. A revolution, wrecking as it does the standards and values of the past, unsettles the society, disturbs the balance of the state, and in spite of all good intentions breaks the spiritual and moral backbone of the people. We need not confound the movement for re-establishing the disturbed balance as a revolution. Further, there can be a revolution intent and conscious of its wrecking mission like the French revolution of 1789 or the Russian revolution of our own times, or a revolution unconscious of its tendencies like the double British revolution of the 17th century for protestantism. Changing of hands in the political government howsoever big as in America may be given the name of revolution by courtesy only; for, we are now speaking not of change of heads or hands, which is ever going on in our world, but of the greater transformations in general social mentality.

This Mighty Vision

The Almighty manifests Himself through the Universe which is His pleasure-pastime and follows his design. He manifests himself also through us. We move under His design and under His rule and line. When we are in tune with the True, the Adorable and the Good, we feel happy. We feel as if unhappy when we are away from it. The great longing of our Being is to be in tune with Him and that way lies our lasting and perfect felicity. This

is the essence of the Conservative attitude. All the great sages and saints of the human race have been Conservatives. We all are conservatives in the ultimate issue. We all believe in the ultimate values of the ancient Divine heritage. Really speaking the opposite of conservative is not liberal. True conservatives try to conserve the precious heritages of veracity, charity, austerity and purity, which have descended from the Divine Revelation unto Man. Thus conservatives true to their principles are liberals in the best sense of the term. The opposite of conservatism of this pure type is revolt, direct or indirect, against the great human assets of morality and religion. The world has progressed through aeons and ages but the old values hold good even now. They know no physical or racial or national or even communal considerations. On the one side are the angels who do His bidding and on the other are Lucifer and his revolting crew. But the philosophy of greater moment and one which was revealed unto Man in the pristine Upanishads is, that all this is but a vision, a dream of dreams and the whole fight, fumbling or fusion is but a pastime not outside God's design. There is a design even in his mirage. The mischief springs and gets wings as we forget that it is His *Leela*, pleasure-pastime and our dream, and in turn involve and entangle ourselves with it as if it were a reality.



Foreground & Fundamentals

Conservative Catechism



(This catechism is intended to cover some important questions that usually occur in relation to the principles and practices of conservatism, especially in India. The questions and answers are put down as tersely as possible. Of course they are meant to be elucidative rather than exhaustive.)



QUESTION 1. What is Conservatism?

ANSWER: Conservatism is the impulse to conserve the best in one's heritage, an impulse more or less common to mankind.

Q. 2. Who is a Conservative?

A. One who believes in man's great heritage and wishes to conserve it for himself and his fellow-men.

Q. 3. What are the objects to be principally conserved?

A. Religion, Kingship, Home and Hermitage.

Q. 4. What is the utility of Conservatism?

A. It makes for the preservation of assets which make mankind normally comfortable, consoled, and inconvenienced amongst tendencies and conditions leading to discontent and misery.

Q. 5. What is Indian Conservatism ?

A. Indian Conservatism is the impulse for conserving the best heritage of India, the cradle-home of the human race.

Q. 6. Should we believe in Reason ?

A. Certainly, on this side of idolatry; and make it a hand-maid of Revelation.

Q. 7. What is Revelation ?

A. Revelation is the knowledge derived from God through divinely inspired personalities.

Q. 8. How can we recognise Revelation ?

A. By three signs viz. (1) That it has come down as such; (2) It is believed in as such; and (3) It is realised as such.

Q. 9. Why not have thorough-going faith in Reason ?

A. Because reason is not a proper guide for fundamentals, being itself imperfect, changing, dependent and fallible. Reason itself is an antidote to Rationalism.

Q. 10. What is Religion ?

A. Religion is the God-given Law and Philosophy of Life.

Q. 11. Which is the Perennial Religion ?

A. Vedic Religion, which is based on the Vedas, the most ancient revelation in a divinely perfect language.

Q. 12. What are its sacred books ?

A. (1) The Vedas (2) the Smritis, (3) the Itihāsas (the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata), (4) the Purānas, and (5) the Tantras: the Vedas being fundamental authority.

Q. 13. What is its relation to other faiths ?

A. It is the parent or fountain-source of all later faiths.

Q. 14. Should there be religious conversions ?

A. Conversions, arising from innate inspiration are unavoidable. Those wrongly induced are undesirable. Ordinarily they are unnecessary.

Q. 15. What is the philosophy of the Vedas ?

A. That the Infinite is the only reality, that the worldly existence is transient, and the Universe is like a dream. The Infinite is Life, Light and Joy, in essence.

Q. 16. What is the solution for world's miseries ?

A. Rehabilitation of faith in religion and religious ways of life.

Q. 17. How can mankind be peaceful and happy ?

A. By the spread of the knowledge and practice of the truths and wisdom propounded in Revelations.

Q. 18. What is real economic prosperity ?

A. Economic prosperity is measurable by the moderate margin of income over expenditure and adequacy of means for easy life.

Q. 19. Are property and capitalism good things ?

A. Property according to moderate needs is instinctive and often an urge to work and virtue. Capitalism is not desirable.

Q. 20. What is the remedy against Capitalism ?

A. The remedy against Capitalism is the overthrow of lucre, lust and luxury from the pedestal of glory.

Q. 21. How do you interpret world's history ?

A. The history of the world is in a descending scale of righteousness and in ascending scale of weaknesses.

Q. 22. How do you interpret Indian History ?

A. In the same way. Deterioration with the decline in righteousness, resulting in foreign rule.

Q. 23. What was the fall of India due to ?

A. To the fall from the religious ideal, not on account of it, nor in spite of it.

Q. 24. What do you think of India's ancient unity?

A. The ancient unity of India was a cultural unity, with a variety of Kshatriya kingdoms.

Q. 25. What about the unity of India to-day ?

A. Ancient cultural unity has gone but the historic cultural parenthood remains. India is the home of primeval human culture and rendezvous of its offsprings.

Q. 26. What is the position of Islam in India ?

A. The Islamic culture is derived from the ancient human culture, India being the home of the parent culture.

Q. 27. What is the relation of Arya Samaj to Hinduism?

A. Arya Samaj is a sect of dissenters from Hinduism who fought formerly with the Hindus on its principal tenets, but are now wisely joining them.

Q. 28. What is the relation of Brahmo Samaj to Hinduism ?

A. Brahmo Samaj is a sect not believing in any Hindu scriptures though airily glorying in India's spiritual heritage. It resulted from first impacts of Christianity.

Q. 29. What is the relation of Jainism to Hinduism ?

A. Jainism is a religious sect with scriptures wholly different from Hinduism, laying extra-normal stress on *Ahimsa* or non-hurt.

Q. 30. Who is a Hindu ?

A. The word Hindu is not really Sanskrit, and became current in Mahomedan times, and means, in general, followers of the main prevalent ancient Indian religion.

Q. 31. What is Hinduism ?

A. The ancient religion of India based on the Vedas and other Shastras.

Q. 32. What are the main features of Hinduism ?

A. The Varnāshrama system of life, belief in the Law of Karma and Rebirth, detailed gradation in standards of duty, and salvation through righteous life, devotion to God and knowledge of the Absolute.

Q. 33. What are the signs of a Hindu ?

A. They vary with the stage, status and ideal of life prescribed for the individual. Ordinarily *shikḥā* is a common outward sign.

Q. 34. How to determine a religion or faith ?

A. A religion or faith is determined by its sacred books.

Q. 35. How to determine the followers of a religion ?

A. A label does not count for much. Usually a follower is expected to have reverential faith in its sacred books and to be trying to follow the religion thereof.

Q. 36. Is he not expected to follow all injunctions fully ?

A. Well, then he is the ideal and perfect follower, a saint and a sage. But perfect religion is like the edge of a sword.

Q. 37. What is the relation between the Society and the State ?

A. Society is the (right) ordainment of the human family. The State is the instrument for its upkeep and protection.

Q. 38. What Constitution would be suited to India ?

A. A confederacy of autonomous states based on cultural or linguistic lines (as expedient) and on ancient traditional principles.

Q. 39. Is Parliamentary democracy suited to India ?

A. Democracy as the System of Government by the will of the majority-party of the people is not suitable for India. It would be ruinous to its cultures, solidarity and peace.

Q. 40. What should be India's ultimate political ideal ?

A. Dharma Rājya or Rama Rājya, as before, with status commensurate with India's prime function of continuing, preserving and propagating the spiritual heritage of mankind.

Q. 41. What should be India's immediate political aim ?

A. Good Government immediately and Swarājya as soon as possible.

Q. 42. What is Swaraj for India ?

A. Government by Indians, in the interest of Indians, according to Indian traditions and in line with Indian ideals.

Q. 43. How do you relate self-government to good government ?

A. Good government is the aim. Self-government is a means to the end. Self-government *may* be bad.

Q. 44. What about Representative government ?

A. The so called Representative government does not really represent all. One force cancels the other and cliques wield the power.

Q. 45. What about Judiciary ?

A. Justice should be simpler, cheaper and swifter. Judiciary under an exploiting system is just the reverse and a means for exploitation.

Q. 46. What about the Democratic system of Government ?

A. The democratic system is an exploiting system of government. Its technique is to gag the people by the elective system, and eliminate opinions by mutual opposition.

Q. 47. Is not democracy most open to correction ?

A. No, the theoretical sovereignty of the people is nullified in practice. People are most prone to passions and dictatorship is the natural Nemesis of democracy.

Q. 48. Is Monarchy better than dictatorship ?

A. Religious Constitutional Monarchy is. Hereditary prince can be educated for kingship, guided by ministers and checked by religious laws and principles. Dictator is autocratic, new-start and unlimitedly powerful.

Q. 49. Is not dictator the people's chosen man ?

A. Yes. It is the people who choose him to rule while it is God's dispensation that chooses a king to rule. A good dictator is a rarity. Dictatorship is absolutism of power.

Q. 50. Is not accident of birth a poor title ?

A. No. There is no accident in nature. Her dispensation is better than man's muddles.

Q. 51. What about democracy in Europe ?

A. Democracy has failed in Europe, even before the war. In the crucial test of belligerency, democracy realises its incompetence and goes in for virtual dictatorship.

Q. 52. What about the New Order ?

A. The so called new orders in Europe are imposing humbugs. Those men-made New Orders cannot last, being based on considerations of power, pelf and self-interest. Only the Order divined by saints and sages God-enlightened, can endure.

Q. 53. What is the remedy for the present evils of the world ?

A. Religion, religion and religion. The old evils appear only in new garb. The disease and the remedies are the same, and old enough.

Q. 54. Is not the remedy of religion antiquated ?

A. Eternal things do not become antiquated. The evils are eternal and the remedies equally so. Human passions are the same, their longings are the same; and in their psychic tangle and complications God-given remedies alone would work.

Q. 55. Are not Revelations themselves impostures and humbugs ?

A. Well, that is for you to see. Keep company with their believers and with their disbelievers; and see whom you can trust better. Try the old sacred recipes, try their opposites, and compare notes.

Q. 56. Are not the proposed New Orders based on charity and justice and so forth ?

A. Partly so. And were it not so they would have short shift immediately, so true are religious principles to innate human longings. But these new orders make big psychic-errors. Why not have the whole instead of the parts mixed with poison ?

Q. 57. Have not religions finished their work ?

A. It is the mislead of misguided intellectuals which has created the impression. Lasting verities and real remedies cannot grow old. Running away from them would not do, howsoever cleverly, tactfully or systematically done.

Q 58. What are the old remedies ?

A. Righteousness in Life, Purity of the Home, Simplicity of living and Asceticism as the highest ideal. In short, the old regimen under the direction of right men.

Q. 59. Would religion make a paradise of the world ?

A. If all follow religion, world would certainly be a paradise. But that is not in due course. But that's the way.

Q. 60. Is it necessary to look to religion for mundane affairs ?

A. Certainly, religion is the law and light of mundane affairs. If we knew that an Indian may be an Englishman, and an Englishman, a German or a Bengalee in his next birth, where would be our small and big enmities? And where our ambitions if we knew that ill gotten gold is transmuted under moral law into bursting bombs ?

Q. 61. Is not "return to religion" too broad a recommendation ?

A. It is clear, definite, and detailed as well as broad. It means a whole ideology, with all details of men, materials and traditions stabilised through ages.

Q. 62. What about Science and scientific progress ?

A. Science is a technique for getting more power. What is wanted is the treatment of the mind that has to wield that power. Science may be as harmful as powerful.

Q. 63. What about Arts and Aesthetics ?

A. Fine Arts may serve as a relief from and an inspiration to life. They are a means to an end. Glorification of God is the noblest end of arts. It is the end or purpose that counts. Arts can be equally misused.

Q. 64. What about the so called useful arts and manufactures ?

A. They have charms and attractions of their own. But beyond a certain limit they mean a loss of time and a waste of human energy. They often spring from or abet the worst elements in human nature as money-greed, luxury and lust.

Q. 65. Can mankind retrace its steps from modern luxuries ?

A. Again, the key is in the mind. Things are not bad in themselves. The social impact to money-greed and the contrivances for artificial money and monetary manipulations may be discontinued and normalities will reassess themselves.

Q. 66. How do you account for modern European progress ?

A. Men were led away by Luther out of the human norms of piety and passions through revolt against the established Church. The French Revolution practically relieved them of the force of Christianity. Lust and licence reasserted themselves in life. For lust, lucre came in demand, for lucre competitive materialism, and then bitter fights and licence.

Q. 67. Are any social reforms needed ?

A. Social reforms are not needed in the principles. They are needed in the men who fail to follow the good principles.

Q. 68. How to secure the amity of all the different communities ?

A. By recognising facts and principles. By recognising Hindus as the *principal community* and recognising

the religious principles of all communities for their respective followers.

Q. 69. What about those who do not believe in any religion ?

A. They may be governed by laws made by the State in consultation with their representatives

Q. 70. Are legislative bodies needed ?

A. No legislative bodies should be needed for fundamental legislation. But regulative houses and chambers are needed for collation of laws and subsidiary regulations.

Q. 71. What state-machinery for supply and appropriations would you propose ?

A. A chamber of deputies for the purpose may be constituted.

Q. 72. How to secure the solidarity of the Hindus ?

A. By following Mr. Jinnah's recipes *mutatis mutandis*. By stopping from reviling Hindu ideals, customs, traditions and institutions, by seeking unity in the great general ideals of Hinduism, by accepting for the Hindus a compact position with least possibilities of disturbances, defalcations and *de marches* from others, and by securing religious and cultural autonomy.

Q. 73. Should there be representative bodies ?

A. Yes, they are necessary under modern conditions. They should be very large, to include all shades of opinions and groups. Their function should be to express opinions and to advise, warn and admonish.

Q. 74. What elective system do you recommend ?

A. Elective groups based on mere location or tax-qualification or money-qualification forcing cross divisions

are undesirable. Voluntary and natural system of social grouping is desirable. Filtration through further secondary elections is also desirable.

Q. 75. Should there be adult suffrage and woman suffrage ?

A. Voluntary system of suffrage by natural social groups eliminates all such questions.

Q. 76. Are the Indian states an anomaly in modern politics ?

A. They are an anomaly to the Westernised, the mischief-mongers and the enemies of Indian culture. They are centres of Indian traditions, customs and culture. States represent the basic system on which to build or improve. The British Empire itself is a limited religious monarchy. The Indian ideal is Rāma Rājya.

Q. 77. Do not modern conditions rule out kingships ?

A. They do not. They offer a choice between monarchies and dictatorships. Even effective presidents are practical dictators.

Q. 78. What is a nation or a nationality ?

A. A Nation means, really, a group of people united by common ties of religion, culture, language, country and institutions. The word is loosely used as expedient.

Q. 79. How to distinguish between Nation and Community ?

A. Nation is a localized tentative political group while communities are cultural or religious groups, with general social relations.

Q. 80. How to distinguish between nationalism and patriotism ?

A. Nationalism is usually based on material considerations of country and government, Patriotism, on the abiding ideals, culture and institutions of the people of the land.

Q. 81. Is Nationalism desirable ?

A. Mere secular Nationalism is not desirable. Religious Nationalism is desirable for India. Religious basis would give it a humanitarian tone and Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs, Christians, Jains, Parsis &c. can accept it.

Q. 82. What is Religious Nationalism ?

A. It is patriotism for one's fatherland, and full faith in one's own religion. *Dieu et patria.*

Q. 83 Can several communities under religious nationalism live peacefully together ?

A. Yes, if they have a will to do so. They actually did, some decades ago, and do so in some Indian states even now. Of course, under present conditions it *has* to be done and is the only way.

Q. 84. Would religious education not strengthen communal antipathies ?

A. Religious education would give the communities a better knowledge of the great and good principles of the religions on which their communities are based. It would give them better principles to live together and lessen the false pride to fight against each other. To deny religious education is to sabotage the community.

Q 85. What is this humbug of untouchability among the Hindus ?

A. Untouchability is not the proper term. Discretion in what and whom to touch is man's fundamental right and such discretion is recognised in all times and countries.

It is a question of purity,—physical, moral, spiritual and hereditary. The right is recognised by all religions.

Q. 86. Is it not a personal right ?

A. It is a personal right, certainly. But it can belong to groups also. Contacts are fundamental matters with which the whole society is concerned, and science recognises it.

Q. 87. What about the Indian National Congress ?

A. It is a big powerful institution. But neither comprehensively Indian nor fundamentally National.

Q. 88. What about the Moderates and Liberals ?

A. They represent mostly the westernised Indians without the dash and push of the Congress. They also have mostly British ideology.

Q. 89. What about the Labourites ?

A. They are following the western clues, nightmares and illusions. There ought to be no such labour-problems in India.

Q. 90. What about the capital-labour problems ?

A. They are of foreign origin. Such big private factories and mills are unnecessary. The whole problem of industries must be tackled in the Indian ways.

Q. 91. Are higher prices and more luxuries not an index of progress ?

A. No. Not even in economics. We want cheap prices and fewer luxuries. The European maxims are against general public good. The stress, strain and jealousies they create, result in social revolt, and political misdirection.

Q. 92. Would you propose a return to the past ?

A. It is not possible, though desirable. We may

go in for as much simplicity as possible, and release human energies for nobler pursuits.

Q. 93. What do you think of the many sects of Hinduism ?

A. They are due to the multiplying weaknesses of men, and have become therefore inevitable. They represent different phases of Vedic religion, specially emphasized.

Q. 94. What should be man's philosophy of life ?

A. Ease through self-control, happiness through devotion, and salvation through absolute knowledge.

Q. 95. What is the Sumum-Bonum of Life ?

A. Peace of Mind. This peace can be secured by (1) righteous life, (2) provision for necessities, (3) attainment of proper desires and (4) the knowledge of absolute verities.

Q. 96. How far is History reliable ?

A. As far as Human observations, judgments and speculations are reliable. We have usually less of history and more of its interpretations.

Q. 97. How far are human judgments reliable ?

A. To a limited extent, and usually so in ordinary matters, for proximate times, places and conditions

Q. 98. Why to believe in divine saints, sages or prophets ?

A. It is all a matter of faith which is based on one's own reason, intuition, experiences and higher impulses.

Q. 99. So then no such are to be believed in by all ?

A. It is not necessary. Neither Truth nor Faith depends on votes.

Q. 100. Is it not the beaten truck of religion which failed in Europe ?

A. No. Europe failed, not the track. Religions merely show the way. If men go the other way, who is to blame? The presence of books in his room all through the year cannot get the student through the examination.

Q. 101. Where can we find maximum truths, values and rationales?

A. In the Primordial Religion of the Human race—the Vedic Religion.

Q. 102. Does it mean that all should return to Vedic Religion?

A. No. It would be a futile attempt. That religion is good for men where God put them by birth, normally speaking.

Q. 103. What, then, is the use of boosting Vedic Religion?

A. For; It is the way to boost all. It is the parent and key to all religions.

Q. 104. Why have not the Britishers and Europeans yet recognized it?

A. For obvious reasons.

Q. 105. What should be the position of India in the world?

A. India should not run after winning other lands or pilfering wealth, but she should be the torch-bearer of humanity and her international attitude should be commensurate with her mission.

Q. 106. What should be India's relation with the Britishers?

A. Of friendship. Neither should it be that between the rulers' and the ruled nor that between the civilisers' and the uncivilised.

Q. 107. What should be India's Lingua Franca if any?

A. Under present conditions English shall have to continue as *lingua franca*. Ideally speaking Sanskrit should be the language of the learned, being the fundamental language of India and equally rightful and distributed to all. For general uses Hindi and Urdu may be utilised.

Q. 108. Is it necessary that India should have one language, one religion, one government and one nationality?

A. It would be an ideal condition if it were so. But under the present conditions neither the world nor India can afford to go in for it. India is a sub-continent. Its languages, religions and nationalities have their own beauties and graces. India shall remain the Central Pilgrim-Home of the Human Race.

Obiter Dicta

The so called modern civilization is a strange amalgam. It is a hotch-potch of Christian forms and Satan's inspirations. Its trend runs counter to Christinity and practically to all religion.

* * * *

The modern European civilization has substituted free *push* of desires in place of the *control* of desires which all religions hold up as the higher human goal. It has made self-assertion the creed of men, instead of self-abnegation and renunciation, as preached by Christianity, Islam and Hinduism. It has raised economic chicanery and money-gulping to the rank of the highest practical goal, instead of the ideals of the Sadhu, the Bhikhu the Fakeer or the Friar who regarded the riches as a hindrance to spiritual progress. It has substituted the liberty of lust and sensuousness instead of the control of the senses and purity of life.

* * * *

The overthrow of the dearest and best of human ideals under the modern civilization has reacted with a vengeance in Communism which wants all wealth and all desire to be liquidated. But the difference is that Communism does not demolish nor dismantle the evil. It concentrates it in the State. Religion ruled out Capitalism without licencing it to the State.

* * * *

In democracy the source of power is erratic, gullible and degenerate. Hence democracy is fundamentally wrong.

It would not do to say that with this or that proviso we can save it from its weaknesses.

* * * *

When we are talking of democracy it is of the democracy proper which derives its power from the people from time to time and knows no other law than that dictated by the majority of the people.

* * * *

Some pseudo-Hindus of the Congress are westernised souls in the Indian garb. They have scant respect for Indian traditions and ideals. They have scant respect for the Hindu and the Moslem as such. Their main god is the political hatred of the foreigner.

* * * *

Most of the leaders of the Congress have espoused the materialistic ideal of life and relegated the Indian's spiritual ideal to the limbo.

* * * *

They have tried to westernize the marriage ideal by forcing the marriagable age beyond puberty, so as to induce the tendency to late marriages and increase of illegitimate contacts. Their whole attitude has been to introduce free physical contacts in society.

* * * *

The democratic principle of majority as the guiding light in thought, word and action is in direct opposition to the tenet of divine Manu, which holds the decision of One enlightened in the Vedas as superior to thousands of voters ignorant of the same.

* * * *

Democracy is the half-way-house between the Divine Temple and the Devil's Den. It is the government of the indifferents by quacks and cads combined,—with the crooks sometimes getting the better of it.

* * * *

Democracy is practically the very negation of some of the highest virtues. It is the creed of make-belief, impostures and assumed fictions of public life.

* * * *

The consequence of democratic mentality is to bring representatives on a lower plane of emotions, passions and arguments; for they succeed better with the multitude than the dry light of Reason or the rectitude of Religion.

* * * *

Mr. Gandhi's technique of giving arbitrary meanings and interpretations has the element of *supplicio veritii and suggestio falsii*. For instance, take the words "passive resistance" or "civil disobedience" in relation to the word "*Satyāgraha*." *Satya* does not mean *passive* or *civil* and *Agraha* does not mean *resistance* or disobedience. *Satyāgrah* should really mean *insistance on truth*. But it would be a hard job to prove that the thing sought for is a *truth*.

* * * *

So *Satyagraha* becomes a codeword. The activity gains by a long honoured word and if it turns out an offence under the law, the way out is to declare that nobody understands it, and Mr. Gandhi becomes the sole interpreter of a word for which the dictionary is impotent.

* * * *

A great English Statesman said of Mr. Gandhi that

he was a great diplomat who would beat any of the Britishers hollow. When interposed and corrected Mr. Gandhi was a saint he replied "Yes, his saintliness is a part of his diplomacy." Really speaking Mr. Gandhi is an odd mixture of Pride, Politics and Piety.

* * * *

Mr. Gandhi's anti-untouchability views are but a part of his loose ideas on the general problem of contact. There was a time when he talked as if his movement was directed against untouchability only, nay especially at the attitude of hatred towards the untouchables. But later on he extended the touch-formula and now stands also for inter-dining and inter-marriage in general. His walks with female props on both sides came in for bitter attacks in the press and he himself acknowledged, later, the impropriety of his doing so.

* * * *

Europeans with their topsy-turvy dance-etiquettes, may not much mind these things but Mr. Gandhi ought to have known better. If there be a touching-tarantula I am sure Mr. Gandhi must have been bitten by it unawares.

* * * *

Man and Society are as inscrutable as Nature of which they are a part. Their interpretation and regulation, therefore, is equally complex and inscrutable. On the one hand the King is praised as the very image of God by Manu and on the other Government is represented as equal to a myriad of slaughter-houses.

* * * *

The best proof of the Vedas being the original Divine Revelation is in history. They have never failed.

The nation that followed the Vedas lives to-day from times immemorial and is going strong as ever.

* * * *

I wonder how such an absurdity as the birth of one species from another entered the head of scientists except to spite the Bible. If one animal can come into being by a combination of certain atoms or electrons or what-nots why not another of a different type from a little different combination? The various types of stones need not have been produced one from the other.

* * * *

The whole mankind belongs to one parent stock and culture. There are some fundamental similarities. The days of the week are the same all over the world. The fundamental numerals are ten all over the world. The great virtues are the same all over the world.

* * * *

The new war has been ironically enough, as bitter as the efforts at peace seemed arduous. War cannot be eliminated; because it is the penalty for life against Nature. The cannon-balls and bombs are not anti-war tablets. Prevailing sovereignty of Religion is the only way to mitigate its ferocity. Men will fight still, but in the old usual and tolerable way.

* * * *

For a better and happier condition of mankind the rule of capitalism and labour *en masse* must go. The modern Industrialism with its ally Capitalism is more harmful than usually supposed. It has vitiated the whole human outlook of life. The ideals must change.

Men are ruled by ideals.

* * *

Communism is fundamentally wrong because it keeps possession as the fundamental issue. It looks on the same side as Capitalism does. It cuts off Individualism and keeps the Capitalism. It does not cure man, it puts him down. It does not improve man it enchains him to its casual and erratic ends.

* * *

Communism is also like religion a *dogmatic* system with the difference that it is Godless and presumes not only to advise the society but also to dictate the State. It thinks for its subjects, it gives them their time-table. That has not been usually considered the business of the State.

* * *

Man's ideals and aspirations as well as rules and regulations of life must come from the Omniscient and Religion which is His light. The state's business is to see that he is not hampered in following them. The only right liberty is the liberty to follow them.

* * *

Faith in God implies three things (1) Faith in his disposition of the Universe (2) Belief in his word and (3) Acting up to his Word.

* * *

For those who deny all religion the state can lay down the rule and line. Even then each individual cannot have his way. Prof. Laski points out that "the effort involved in the peaceful maintenance of a common life does not permit the making of private decision upon what the society deems essential to existence. At some point

the enforced acceptance of a common way of action becomes the necessary condition of corporate civilization." We may note here that a religious community is a voluntary corporate body with a common way of life

* * * *

In India we have not insisted on child-marriage. What we have insisted upon is marriage about the age of puberty.—especially for the female Choice marriage, is a natural consequence of taking marriage a great deal further than maturity.

* * * *

Choice marriage, in common ways and means, vitiates the whole attitude towards sex in life. For when the marital connections are to be based upon picking and preference one begins to look upon many of the opposite sex as possible, eligible, examinable units of an exploitable clientele.

* * * *

In India religion is not merely the private concern of man with his God, but it is the Law of Life. And to neglect it for a mostly foreign secular training is to give up the natural and impose the unnatural angle of vision.

* * * *

The religious spirit should permeate Indian education. It permeates our life and have we not a right to demand that it should permeate our education ?

* * * *

The atheist or the agnostic makes much of the discrepancies, and the differences and so forth of religions. He does not want religions at all but he prefers to get

rid of them by setting one religion against the other. Gullible people are persuaded that religion is the cause of strife; and the case for religious education is summarily dismissed.

* * * *

It is in the psychic value towards virtue and harmony that the sacred books of world's great Religions stand supreme and unrivalled

* * * *

The great fact is that we cannot make or create good things unless we are good ourselves. And goodness is in a way, more difficult even than greatness. Hence we worship the Saints and Rishies who were *good* in the fullest sense of the word; good in themselves, good to all, and good before the Creator.

* * * *

Even greatness is difficult, for, it presupposes a quota of goodness. To-day what we have is bigness;—in men and material, plans and politics, booms and buildings. They are all big. Greatness is of another type. It is the consecration of aim that makes for greatness.

* * * *

Such great men are not cheap like the political candidates. They are to be wooed, for they are the gems of the human race, and the salt of the earth.

* * * *

The curse of democracy is that it practically rules out of its machinery the best of the human race. Democracy has served as a gigantic cover-trick to shelve God and put man in his place over the affairs of the world.

Nature smiles at the attempt and says to her child
*“ Yes ? Little Wayward, try it. I am here, yet, to
 look after you.”*

* * * *

The whole idea of forging the Indian constitution
 on novel models at a stroke, at the dictation of a few
 representatives, is fundamentally wrong and unacceptable.

* * * *

Those who are out of tune with the nation's ideals,
 usages and practices are unfit to frame a constitution for
 India, howsoever apt or effective they may be in declaim-
 ing against foreign rule.

* * * *

The westernised congressites tried their hand at a
 constitution in the Nehru-Report. The people rejected it
 because by their extra-national ideals and ambitions they
 unwittingly ran counter to the real longings of the nation.
 But, to do justice to them, they were not slaves to the
 British ideal, which gives several chapters in the British
 Magna Charta to Religion. They can challenge you to
 show even the word ‘ God ’ in the Nehru-Report.

* * * *

Mr Gandhi used to speak admiringly and exultingly
 about the Dharmarājya and Rāmarājya even from the
 Congress platform. But of late the expediency of placat-
 ing the Molems seems to have led him to drop the
 ideals. And if somebody reminds him of Rāmarājya his
 usual artifice of interpretation is ready at hand. The
 words he uses must certainly be as obedient as the men
 he uses.

* * * *

It is not pessimism when we say that the intellect or the morals or the spiritual powers of men have declined. It is merely a registering of the facts. It would be optimism to disregard them and colour the picture with the colour of our glasses. We may have to be very badly disillusioned.

* * * *

The method of the ancients was not to rail at vice and weaknesses which they knew were common enough in the human race. What they did was to honour the good and raise them to fame.

* * * *

There is practically an apparatus by which a whole multitude of ninety to ninety-nine per cent can be made to vote for you. The would-be Dictator incites some psychic urge or instinct and manages to work up a whirlwind propaganda to carry everything before him.

* * * *

Can we not get out of this cry for democracy which not coinciding with facts always falls flat ultimately ? Why should a government fight shy of calling itself a kingdom or an empire ?

* * * *

The king or the monarch *does* not and *cannot* rule according to his arbitrary will. He should be but the executive head for putting into effect the sacred laws of religion. As soon as he assumes arbitrary powers in opposition to them he forfeits his claim to the place of the king.

* * * *

The essence which gives point to democracy is that there must be room for the voice of the people in every State. In India the Sovereign's *Durbar* supplied this great need. Even when you resort to representatives of *all*, you imply that everybody has a right to be heard. In India the opportunity and consequent justice was given to everyone. The king was above all parties and all the subjects were to be regarded as his children.

* * * *

People are often at variance, even at daggers drawn, with their fellows. Democracy takes advantage of these hostilities and manages to rule through the chance-majority that turns up. It does not rule by the will of the people, manifestly because the will of all the people is not identical or coinciding. It rules by fighting one will against the other, sometimes eliminating both or ruling both on their head.

* * * *

Democracy is ultimately the very antithesis of the rule of the people. It is this irony which is illustrated by the rising taxes, the increasing national debts, the ruining of the home, and the increasing crimes in democracies.

If the vote of the people is the criterion and if majority is the final determinant, it would not do to say that the voting was wrong when it goes with a Hitler or a Stalin. The whole theory is equally bad either here or there. Representative government is practically a gagging device to exploit the people. Only a novelist with insight into psycho-analysis can do justice to the

tricks, frauds and chicaneries of the democratic vote-catching machinery of to-day.

* * * *

The trick of the modern propagandist of Democracy is to make capital out of the instances available not on account of but in spite of democracy. You can easily get at such instances; for, Nature is a Monarchy with a Hierarchy. Even when you bring together a motely crowd to vote individually, it usually votes to the dictation of the few or the one.

* * * *

Is there anything in the democratic principle to force the people not to vote by their homogeneous social groupings and to force on them cross-divisions based on other grounds as of location, wealth or party?

* * * *

'Government by Majority' means that "*numerical might is right*." Its tendency is to discount ideals and principles and its effect is to develop offensives.

* * * *

We can divide Governments into two kinds:—(1) Government by weightage of Principles and (2) Government by that of Persons. In the one persons are to be over-ruled by principles, and in the other the principles are overruled by the number of persons.

* * * *

A great Sovereignty becomes an Empire, whatever name You give to it. I wonder how a few rebels have succeeded in bringing into disrepute the ideas of Empire and of Marriage. It is even as Satan's crew succeeded

in doing the same with the name of God. There is always a floating material of the discontented, on the fringe of faith, who are ready to go over to the other side on a slight temptation.

* * * *

The British Empire embodies Religious Constitutional Monarchy working for the People with the advice of the Representatives Spiritual and Temporal, on recognized religious and social principles.

* * * *

Theocracy is, willy nilly, the natural universal constitutional form of government. Mutual jealousies, however, between the different sects have so undermined the prestige of the word that another word like Theonomy may be coined to advantage. We may understand the same difference to exist between theocracy and theonomy as exists between autocracy and autonomy. Theocracy is rule in the name of God Theonomy should denote rule by the laws of God.

* * * *

The whole perview changes with the ideal of Theonomy. There is no longer a struggle between the overbearing rich and the helpless poor. Poverty comes to be respected. Voluntary poverty becomes the badge of self-denial and discipline, fit to direct the State. Sages and saints become the oracles to the Sovereign.

* * * *

To say that all men are equal and to treat them as unequal is hyprocracy of a sort. Really speaking the behaviour is an acquiescence in truth. If all men were

treated as equal we should be soon in the realm of comic absurdities. We know they are not equal, and we act accordingly. Not only the heredity counts, not only the breeding counts, but every single cell of the body and every single feature of the psyche counts. You know its value in course of time but all the while it is there, working in its own way.

* * * *

The condition precedent for a coalition is a spirit of accomodation and compromise. The consequence of party government in a country like India where the parties differ not in degree but in kind of public measures, is to force the party's fads, feuds and fictions on the people. It is the European ignorance of Indian conditions that is responsible for forcing European political methods on India

* * * *

To dogmatize that the people have a right to determine their own constitution according to the chance composition of the so-called representatives in a Constituent Assembly is to forget history as well as humanity. That people have sometimes done it as at the French Revolution to their own ruin or in the Russian Revolution to the ruin of the noblest human ideals, only shows the mischievousness of the principle and the procedure. No generation has a right to play such grave mischief on posterity and to deprive it of the precious legacies of the past. No such right can exist in the nation and if it ruins the heritage of the race, it is a crime for which it has to pay like France by its own mortification.

* * * *

All peoples are but trustees of the great cultural heritages of the past and a party ceases to have any right to bungle them when it envisages and champions a different ideology of *re formation*.

* * * *

The ancient cultural ideas of the human race are there in its Sacred Books, revealed by God. All *other* ideals can rest on force, frivolity or fiction.

* * * *

To say that all are equal is not only to utter a falsehood but to play a trick of *suppreccio verii*. It discounts the facts of vice and virtue, sin and merits.

* * * *

There is no royal road to happiness but goodness. Happiness is such a complicated condition of the mind as defies prescriptions. It can exist without bank-balances and a beauty by the side, while it can be absent with full coffers and a honeyed beauty at home. Perhaps happiness may be described as the reaction of goodness.

* * * *

Goodness is goodness. The idea need not be modernised into new-sounding words such as Civility, Culture, Character Philanthropy and the rest of the new elastic variety.

* * * *

It is but meet that Hitler who kicked Christian Orthodoxy for national socialism should appear in a country where Martin Luther kicked Catholicism for more intimate worldly-contacts.

* * * *

The spirit of revolt against law and order is the same old spirit which distinguished the fallen Archangel, the same spirit which ruled Milton and made his *Paradise Lost* a more effective work than his *Paradise Regained*. It is but a tribute to the eternal values that Milton was a puritan though a protestant. Revolts and rebellions would not endure for a day if they did not parade under the guise of virtue, benevolence and freedom.

* * * *

Some people complain why knowledge should be reserved. They forget that knowledge is jealously guarded in times of peace and war. The power of knowledge in bad or unworthy hands may mean the ruin of ideals, heritages, society and the state.

* * * *

India holds the highest peak of the World. Mankind rose up here. Here God gave it His Light which is in the Vedas. From here it spread in the world. All that is good and true anywhere thus came from India and all that is peculiarly and fundamentally Indian according to the divine Light is good and true.

* * * *

It is noteworthy that the original Indian society was pre-eminently based on fundamental principles and ideals while later societies though good enough in their own way will be found to be dominated by some such dominant aims as power, bravery, efficiency, wealth, beauty or pleasures.

* * * *

The ancient epics, The Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata are full of fundamental truths and wonderful illustrations

which would seem to be almost perfect allegories But we find their footprints and actuals in our own material world.

* * * *

The humbug of the equality of men is not only false to life but it is also a source of manifold perversions in life. With the idea of equality reverence and homage, praise and devotion, tend to become meaningless and come in due course to be discredited. The relations between the master and the servant, the teacher and the taught, the employer and the employed become strained. The scoundrel assumes the pose of the saint and the pickpocket the perjurer and the puritian have to be in the same role of equals.

* * * *

They speak of Man's right to *as much* liberty as would not interfere with the liberty of others. This is as tricky as to describe one unknown by relation to another unknown. Both are equally uncertain and interdependant.

* * * *

Democracy ultimately implies the negation not of these or those principles but of all principles; it is the doctrine of drift to where you are drifted by the majority that happens.

* * * *

The orthodox Hindus in their general view of life are conservatives, in their political partialities they are thoroughly Indian and in their sympathies they are liberally humanitarian. Their policy must therefore partake of this threefold nature. They cannot afford to be either betrayers of their cultures or rabbidly communal or anti-national reactionaries.

* * * *

Democracy has not quite failed in Europe. In a sense, it has succeeded in ruining her home. It has ruined her morals, it has ruined her economics and above all it has ruined her Christian civilization. Hence it is perhaps, that they are making short work of it there.

* * * *

Democracy does not mean the power of the people, it means the domination of its looser elements. In the mind there are the two elements the stronger and the looser.

* * * *

Chronological pygmies talk of a New Order, while the so called Old Order is but a child not two hundred years old. It was born in 1789 and it has already begun to tumble into the grave.

* * * *

We have, simply to revitalize the perennial order – the *Permanent Order* of the human race which has behind it the authority of Manu, Vyāsa and Vashistha, Budhha, Christ and Mahomed, Moses, Zarthustra and others of the Divine line of Saints and Sages. It is the only order which can keep up *humanity* in the human race.

* * * *

We have been heartily tired of these experiments at New Order by a Rousseau and Engels and Marx and a lot of them. They have made the confusion worse confounded.

* * * *

It is as absurd to expect the sub-continent of India lastingly under one uniform sovereignty as to expect the whole of Europe-cum-Russia to be under a British king

or under a Dictator. There is a greater variety in India of language, religion, traditions, dress, habits and cultures. In fact it would mean the destruction of ancient Indian States and the ruin of the great and beautiful integral cultures of the various countries in India.

* * * *

I have often wondered at Europeans, who are under effective all-round control, talking in loud tones about liberty. Perhaps they do so by way of reaction. There can be no freedom from principles of goodness and truth. Europe will be digging its own grave in seeking freedom from all principles and making "*the people's desire*" the only rule and line of conduct.

* * * *

There is only one freedom I know of, and that is the *freedom to act righteously*. And righteousness can be properly interpreted and defined by the divine revelation, i. e. the Word of God.

* * * *

All democratic politics has a tendency to drift into the hands of moneyed interests, because money makes up the chief sinews of its warfare.

* * * *

Democracy, manifestly seeks to rule by the *will* of the people, whereas they should be ruled by *principles*. Any man of experience will see the absurdity of even an individual going merely by his will. The absurdity is as great or greater in setting up the same principle for a whole multitude. Democracy often ekes out a tolerable existence by cancelling mutual desires, and thus becomes workable by running counter to its own principles.

* * * *

Democracy, at best, is Rule by the consent of the best inspiration of men. Man's highest stable allegiance is to Religion. From this angle of vision the best democracy is Government by Religion.

* * * *

The consequences of the doctrine of Liberty are disastrous. As all government political, social and moral, means control, the doctrine can easily work in certain ways against all control and discipline as well as against all power and authority. The doctrine of liberty is a manifest absurdity. Its only chance lies in being qualified by provisos, modified by facts and nullified in practice.

* * * *

That all desire liberty is not a point material to the issue. Whether all should have liberty,—the freedom to think, speak and act as each one likes—that is the question. If the thing is good there would be no need for vindicating the liberty to do it. If it be bad the liberty is manifestly undesirable. If it be indifferent to any public good or harm it would need no attempt at vindication or suppression.

* * * *

A government curtails or cuts off a particular freedom when it goes seriously against it in times of peace or war. The remaining liberty is usually either libertinism in individual life, or licence against society.

* * * *

We need not be chary of doctrines or dogmas. All belief is really a doctrine of one or many. Non-religious doctrines are doctrines all the same. Religion is the recognised doctrine of its followers.

1 * * * *

All government is a systematization of control by force; and the less of it the better, especially under a democracy. But it happens just the other way.

* * * *

If people be governed according to their religion it would be government by their voluntarily accepted principles of life. It would mean rule of the people in accordance with the higher will of their life

* * * *

The liberals who parade democracy and liberty and equality without understanding their ultimate implications are doing justice neither to the people nor to themselves. Hence it is that they have lost their moorings and their men.

* * * *

I have often wondered how some people parade democracy before the public, even after they find it to be unreasonably erratic. It is admitted that real ideal democracy is impossible, that the voting systems are bad and faulty, that the results do not tell the right tale, that universal suffrage is not put into practice, that even if it be it would be useless or valueless without a thoroughly educated electorate, that elections are not honestly and properly conducted, that parliamentary majorities are often heedless and even tyrannous, that democracy has failed in practice in so many countries: and yet the superstition of democracy persists in spite of it all. The reason of this persistence lies in its great appeal to the vain and the gullible.

* * * *

Communalism in its higher aspect is not so bad as it is made out to be. Nationalism is material patriotism

while communalism is social patriotism. Nationalism bereft of religious spirit tends towards anti-religious materialism while communalism though tending to the smallness of the communal ideal, helps the consolidation of the culture and unity of the community. Nationalism breaks up the community, communalism builds up its strength.

* * * *

Communalism goes by the unity of principles common to the community. Thus it is a group-force of a centrifugal character. Like religious sects communities are railed at or ruined by the envy and enmities of sister-communities.

* * * *

The Hindu Community has been beaten low by the foreign hatchets with the Indian handles.

* * * *

The key to Moslem unity is that they have combined under the religious ideal. They have, wisely, not thought of being wiser than their sages and saints and of presuming to reform their community. Hindus with a longer and greater heritage have been up in arms against themselves. They have freely censured their culture, their ancestors and their religion.

* * * *

The Congress under Mr. Gandhi is in a very anomalous position. The majority of its leaders are Hindus by birth and name but out of tune with the Hindu society. The Congress has to go pro-Moslem if it has to pose as representing India. So it is non-Hindu in conviction and non-moslem at heart. Its only hope is to claim that it represents both, not in their likes but in their dislikes, not positively but negatively.

* * * *

Fortunately the Religion of the Hindus is strong enough to weather the storms of even more virulent onslaughts. It rests unscathed, perhaps the brighter for the friction.

* * * *

The great mischief of Democracy proper i. e. Sovereignty of the People or rule *by* the people, is that it submerges or sacrifices all the nobler ideals of the human race to the political ideal and the political standpoint.

* * * *

As we do not want democracy so also we do not want Dictatorship. Unbridled rule of a tyrant is not to be chosen to the hap-hazard rule of the multitude nor *vice versa*. The Law of God or religion is the only proper basis of society. The state is for the society and not the society for the state. Theocracy or religious monarchy helped by the aristocracy of virtue and talent, and with opportunity for the expression of public opinion is just the right form of good government. Burke rightly said that religion is the basis of civil society and the source of all good and of all comfort, that man is by his constitution a religious animal and that atheism is against not only our reason, but our instinct and can not prevail.

* * * *

It is one of the ironies of the present situation that the Congress Hindu leaders are going directly counter to Hindu orthodoxy. This is perhaps due to the fact that their education never trained them to be good Hindus. They are what their education made them—good fighters and indifferent Hindus.

Western democracy is a disease which may end with the disruption and death of the peoples. Partisans need not pretend that absolute dictatorship is the only alternative to democracy. To do so would be to forget all history which says that religiously constituted hereditary monarchy has endured in civil society for thousands and thousands of years. Every democracy digs its own grave and is ruined within a couple of centuries.

* * * *

Why should India need an untried new constitution overnight? Are the interest and peace and order of thirty-five crores of men so valueless as to be entrusted to a disputed political experiment? The cardinal sting is in the foreign rule not even in the present constitution. This the Britishers naively pass over.

* * * *

The fight about the form of the constitution is really *a fight for power* for one's own party. If the cardinal sting be removed the constitution-making can take its own course. The constitution can evolve according to India's needs as perceived in course of time.

* * * *

The Indian political tangle is due to Britain's diplomatic policy of comforting India while keeping their own hold, and the Indians' wrangling at the constitution to draw out independence by their diplomacy. It is a fight between diplomacies.

* * * *

The moderns fail in their projects of peace, prosperity and order because they begin the wrong way. They

only recollect how clever they are and forget the agency that made them so. They forget that they are creatures first and creators next. It is their fashion to draw out schemes for managing and manipulating mankind according to their own casual considerations and calculations. Mankind is too big a body to be managed and nature is too strong an agent to submit to orders but those of its Divine Maker.

* * * *

Europe was put on the false scent from the time of Martin Luther. The spirit of revolt against authority of God and Religion is of course old enough but in modern European history it began with the protest of reformation, it developed strength with the declamations of the French revolution and it has culminated in the positive godlessness of the communist upheaval.

* * * *

The trouble is that those who give up God soon get into the clutches of the Devil. It is the old tale being told from day to day in human history. The moral and intellectual rationing of the people is done either according to the dispensation of the one or of the other.

* * * *

We are told that each man should have the right for the fullest exercise of all his faculties compatible with the same right in others. This makes us not a bit the wiser, for the faculties of all and sundry are unknown quantities.

* * * *

The worst mischief of democracy is that it tends to be a Totalitarian state. Religion, culture, morality are all secondary concerns to the Totalitarian State.

* * * *

A democracy is opposed to Monarchy but it may very well become a Totalitarian State and may easily become a practical dictatorship.

* * * *

War is not an accident. It is not a maladjustment, it is a readjustment.

* * * *

Wars cannot be stopped by peace-propaganda. Sometimes such propaganda is a ruse for getting time for preparation. Wars can decrease only by lessening the value of that for which wars are usually waged and by teaching men adoration of ideals higher than self and power.

* * * *

Dogma and dogmatism were freely condemned some time ago. Since the rise of Bolshevism they have come into power with a vengeance. It seems in these days you have to say a thing with a strong determination and it will pass muster.

* * * *

The notion of Equality is a broader of slights and fights. God has created variety - difference - inequality, giving everyone his peculiarity, individuality and relative position. The ghost of equality makes men take the wrong pose and fight amongst themselves.

* * * *

In fact Nature abhors equality. It establishes the three-fold distinguishing filter of Time, Space, and Substance.

* * * *

All things are variations, permutations and combinations of various degrees of the *Gun*as. *Gun*as are primary properties embodying the functional traits: static, erratic and dormic.

* * * *

The whole emotional symposium of Nature is based on organic or fundamental differences. Man reacting on woman, the powerful on the powerless, the learned on the ignorant, the rich on the poor, the beautiful on the ugly, the virtuous on the vicious.

* * * *

Some inequalities and differences are complementary. They co-operate for some creation, physical, political, economic or intellectual. Variety therefore is the spice of life just as love is the sweetness of life and co-operation is the grace of life.

* * * *

Equality is not only undesirable but it is impossible of attainment. Beauty spots and beauty lots are rare in Nature. To whom would they go? The same power in the State or Society cannot be possessed by all. How will you give it to all when all have seen that representation is a clever joke and that delegation of power is practically surrender of power.

* * * *

God's ways are inscrutable. Inequalities have really increased with the raising of the cry of equality. It is a

veritable irony of Fate that Russia and even the other big powers of Europe are having it with a vengeance.

* * * *

To me it seems that that the cry for liberty of speech and action has been born of disbelief or ignorance of truth altogether. When I do not know the truth and do not know which is which, I ask or allow or invite everybody to give his own say. If I knew that seven plus nine makes sixteen I would not plead for getting opinions nor for tolerance to the variety of other answers.

* * * *

Man's fumbling for opinions came into vogue since he gave up the faith in the word of God by the insinuations of the fallen archangels.

* * * *

There is the allegory of the Fruit of the forbidden Tree in the Bible. I wonder what the original Hebrew means, but it may be the Tree of Opinion, rather than the Tree of Knowledge.

* * * *

To recognise religion is to acknowledge the Distinction between Vice and Virtue.

* * * *

To put nationalism above religion is to regard local affinity as higher than the nobler aspects of human life. The higher humanitarianism will also seek the unity of men through the standard of virtue rather than the mere standard of location or political Government.

* * * *

The dethronement of the moral standards is a calamity which can hardly be realised in normal times And moral

standards which are effective and lasting can only succeed through and formed by Religion. Patched up moral-rearmaments cannot take its place.

* * * *

I have often wondered how the *adjective* 'right' got to be a *substantive*. My right must mean that which is right for me. My right thus means the activity proper for me, that is to say my duty. That which I claim from others is my claim not my right.

* * * *

So it is with the people. It is never right to do a wrong thing. There it can never be right. For instance the Right of Association must mean the right of good Association.

* * * *

Democracy is the fruitful source of duplicity, imposture and false pretences in public life. These are the natural and usual consequences of that need of pleasing multitudinous voters on the one hand and camouflaging unpleasant opinions on the other. *Suppressio verii* and *suggestio falsii* are raised up to the dignity of a public art.

* * * *

With all cultured peoples, the cultural problem is the primary and the fundamental problem. The constitutional problem is to subserve the main end. The constitution settles the allocation of power and the power finally determines the lot of the people under the State.

* * * *

The common religion of humanity is also the common-sense religion. It is as old as man, it has come

from God, his Creator, and it has been preserved with due reverence. Further, it is doled out by sages and saints with varying emphasis.

* * * *

We may take it that the mission of the Congress is over, and it must be substituted by a Federation of Cultural bodies and Leagues which may unite India under a spiritual hegemony led by the Hindus and strengthened by Moslems, Shikhs and others, which may soon command the homage of the world.

* * * *

As the word goes, Democracy is in its inception a coercion of the majority over the minority, in its working it is an imposition of the few over the many and in its tendencies it is a push for moral degeneration.

* * * *

Democracy in a big country like India or China is a positively effective way of dividing, disjointing and decomposing a country.

* * * *

There is no *raison d'être* for the State except for the protection of religious conditioning of society.

* * * *

There can be no greater enemies to India than those who knowing the world-conditions and the mischief of democracy agree to its introduction in India. Democracy in India would increase the exploitation of people by State machinery, sabotage their culture and civilization and cut at the root of national harmony beyond possibility of amendment.

* * * *

A government which boosts the humbug of liberty becomes the pawn of its own game.

* * * *

Liberty is cleverly qualified by provisoes, modified by facts and transformed by interpretations in other countries and the humbug is kept alive by licences; but the consequences of the doctrine are disastrous.

* * * *

The very doctrines of liberty, equality and democracy are revolutionary. They upset the established ancient moral, social and political order of society. Powerful fallen archangels have sown the thorns and the world is reaping the harvest.

* * * *

Revolution by itself is not an evil but a revolution towards atheism, and moral debasements is certainly a great evil.

* * * *

Europe is enjoying no more the noble Christian civilization. That has flown away long since; Europe is now running in the materialistic, utilitarian and self-assertive civilization. Communism which raises up capital to the highest pedestal by making for state-capitalism is the climax of capitalistic mentality. Like the scorpion's progeny communism is out for killing its parent. Both are equally harmful to mankind.

* * * *

The central force to be conserved is the Fundamental Religion. Fundamental religion recommends godliness, veracity, charity austerly and purity.

* * * *

When there is such a gulf of difference in the units of human race as Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah, or Hitler and Roosevelt, or Mirabai and Nila Nagini, or Shankara and Voltaire, to thrust the humbug of equality is hardly anything short of the betrayal of truth and misleading of intellectual simpletons.

* * * *

Conservatism means the tendency—the conscious tendency to conserve the spiritual, moral, social, and political heritage of the human race. It proceeds from the conviction that this heritage is good for the human race, Religions are the spiritual heritage, honest life is the moral heritage, the pure family is the social heritage and the righteous monarchy is the political heritage.

* * * *

The spirit of libertinism is the target against which conservatism has to fight. And it must incidentally be prepared to suffer for the law and order under religion and monarchy than to seek the advantages of spiritual anarchy, moral perversion and democratic tyranny.

* * * *

The conservative forces in the world are great and multitudinous but they must be united and pull together. As it is, one set is fighting the other. The fights of the conservative forces *inter se*, are Satan's opportunity.

* * * *

Modern politics are veering towards the idea of a Totalitarian state which practically believes in the dicta: "Nothing against the state, Nothing without the State, Everything for the State, beyond the State nothing."

* * * *

The Hindus, Moslems, Shikhs and other religious communities have to meet the Nationalism which relegates all religion to the back-ground, and have to modify it.

* * * *

Here are some interesting quotations:—

“Not a year elapses without hundreds of unmarried girls of 13 giving birth to babies in England”—*John Bull*.

“Virginity no longer exists in England”—Mr. T. B. Partington, F. I. C., F. R. E. S.

“Early marriage is the only solution for abortion, unmarried motherhood etc”—Dr. Paul Bellard.

“All parties are united in the opinion that Hindu married life is an exceptionally happy state.”—Mr. Frederic Pincett.

* * * *

The problem of marriageable age is a problem of common sense. Convenience often modifies the decisions. The general answer however is the same from all those who value purity or chastity more than other conveniences. It is that marriage must take place before the passions begin to wander and make the mind restive and the character dubious.

* * * *

We have been in the habit of thinking that this or that institution or constitution can make us happy. We usually forget that there is no shift-key of institutions or constitutions to happiness. At best they are royal roads through which we may *pass* unto happiness.

* * * *

Men can be happy only by a righteous life in their

own being. For, happiness, pleasures and prosperity are but the reaction of our own actions. They are the natural responses of our moral movements.

* * * *

The British Constitution is not a democracy. It is monarchy – hereditary monarchy – religious monarchy – constitutional monarchy. Its claim to democracy would not bear analysis. Perhaps constitutional thinkers know it very well.

* * * *

The Indian Native States are centres not only of Hindu power as Mr. Savarkar says, they are also representatives of important phases of Indian culture.

* * * *

If the communities in India are to remain and are not to cease to function as such in public and practical life, it goes without saying that the creation of communal boards is a natural corollary.

* * * *

The problem whether we should have democracy or good government after Swarajya is of material and vital moment for India. For on it will ultimately depend the line of policy as regards the Indian States. The Indian States must not be merged in a big democracy. It would mean their ultimate extinction.

* * * *

When I am talking of democracy it is in the proper sense of the word: viz. a constitution in which the basic, real and final power remains with the majority of the people in all matters. We should realise fully that such

a democracy is not the right thing for India. Otherwise with all good intentions we may be on the wrong scent.

* * * *

Under the British regime we possessed to a certain extent cultural autonomy. But now we are told by our managers with their tongues in their cheeks that now the foreigners rule no longer; your own men are your rulers; so they can order society to their pattern. So a bogus political autonomy has come and the cultural autonomy has gone. That is the position of the Hindus. Hence the Moslems are impatient and say that they will never barter away their cultural autonomy.

* * * *

If culture and cultural autonomy are to be preserved there must be a statutory body to preserve them. They cannot be left to the mercies of men elected on different issues, for different purposes and on a heterogeneous ballot-vote.

* * * *

Dr. Helen Wodehouse, lecturer in philosophy at the University of Birmingham says "No one I believe has ever claimed infallibility for inference"—"No knowledge worth speaking of is infallible"—"No one concrete purpose or valuation can be pronounced *a priori* to be certainly right, not even our most primitive instincts, or our most delicate institutions or our most faithful loyalty to general rules"—"Of no kind of experience can we say: Here error is impossible."

* * * *

Even G. Hackenschmidt, the Russian Lion, a wrestling champion of the world asserts that "Man is degenerating in physique to an extent that is alarming" and that "Perfection must come from within."

* * *

"Evolution means unfoldment—the expression in a sequential process of certain types, attributes, faculties or power—but it has come to connect the implications of the Darwinian hypothesis—the conclusion that man can trace his descent from the animal" "Evolution is understood to imply that something of lower order becomes in process of time something of a higher order"

—G H. Benner in the "Nineteenth Century & After"

* * *

"I have no faith whatever either in science, invention or mechanics to solve social problems or make life easier and happier for the mass of the people. The instinct of the Luddites to smash the machines was a sound one."

—Anon.

* * *

Ratzel in his history of mankind points out that "Ethnology knows no race devoid of religion but only differences in the degree to which religious ideas have developed."

—Ratzel's History of Mankind I 40.

* * *

Shivaji was great, Akbar was great, Alexander was great, Tajmahāl is great. The Tajmahal Hotel is merely big.

* * *

Religion is the only ideal to which humanity can subscribe as the fundamental and final ideal. The difficulty with all other ideals is that they create loyalties which

are ultimately slippery or ruinous. In all great decisions it is the ultimate loyalties that count.

*

*

*

Let us take for instance the national ideal or the æsthetic ideal or the liberty ideal; and we will find that ultimate reference to them as the Law of Life is ruinous. The national ideal ruins the humanitarian ideal, the æsthetic ideal ruins the stability of the Home and the liberty ideal ruins the integrity of character.

*

*

*

We may note that in the ultimate analysis, final ideals refuse to be qualified. They tolerate no hurdles and bear no handicaps.

*

*

*

"My nation above all" says the nationalist. He lays down his life for the nation. He fights for the nation in war and in peace. He defends the nation: Good or bad or indifferent is no consideration.

*

*

*

The æsthetic enthusiast runs after this or that beauty here and there and as beauty is evanescent, unequal and ever-changing he sacrifices any interest or any principles social, moral or political to his ideal. We may note however, that this ideal works only under camouflages such as love, culture and the like, amongst individuals. But when it affects society, it loosens all morality and vitiates public service.

*

*

*

The ideal of liberty is the most mischievous. Satan

was its founder and arch-champion. It knows no limits and finds a thousand excuses.

* * *

Life is a mystery, the universe is a mystery, the beyond is a mystery, because our vision is small. It is the light of God alone that can unfold the mystery. Hence we seek that light. To those enlightened with that light the riddles and the mystery are solved. The best solution to the riddles therefore lies in the sacred books of the human race of which the *Shrutis*, *Smritis* and the *Puranas* are the foremost and fundamental.

* * *

There are some philosophical riddles which puzzle men. The foremost of these is one which was much in the air at the French revolution. How could a good God have made a world with such miseries? Several answers are given, which assume God as the manager of our affairs. The easiest solution however is that men get the rewards and retributions of whatever actions they do. There is the law of Karma, action and reaction or, action and its consequence, pervading the whole universe. God is not the chauffeur but the sun unto men's lives.

* * *

Then there is another riddle, though a smaller one about the Law of Karma itself. How does it work? Is there free will and voluntary action at all? Or is there perfect determinism? Now, this is as simple and as complicated as the affairs of our ordinary life. We inherit from our birth some legacies and some debts, we enjoy the legacies and pay the debts partly or wholly. In the meanwhile we make some new money by ourselves and

perhaps create some debts also. These new earnings and new debts add to our similar items in the account books. We pass away from the country go to another but our assets and liabilities remain. In the account books of nature the accounts are automatic and there is no mistake. Surely here also there are gifts and, *writing off* of accounts.

* * *

People are complaining that International Law is not respected and that there should be a sanction behind the International Law. The International Law was respected because it was founded on the fundamental laws of Religion. With the dismantling of Religion from the State, the respect for International Law automatically evaporates.

* * *

The right of a Sovereign state to make war on another can rest only on the grounds of the great fundamentals of morality and religion i. e. for the protection of religion and morality within the State, or their propagation outside the State.

* * *

The International Law is not man-made law. It exists by the force of fundamental religious values and it has been undone because those values have been disputed or disregarded. It can rest only and does rest on supernatural sanctions which bind men in spite of themselves.

* * *

It is good that society should be governed by the laws and ideals which it tacitly believes in. The community tacitly believes in the laws and ideals described by its religion. It follows therefore that it should be ruled according to its religion.

* * *

The principle underlying democracy that the people should be governed by their own will is as flimsy as that an individual should be governed by his own will. If every man's will was a law to himself many would soon go to the walls or to the gutters or to the gallows. A man's will can safely become the law of his being and becoming, only if it is in line with the laws of morality and religion, which make him safe for himself and for society.

*

*

*

We need not go far to understand where the mischievous doctrine of liberty would lead to. Our own homes or offices or schools can be made the ever-ready laboratories of the doctrine. The wildest apostle of liberty would soon be a convert to Conservatism. The cry of liberty is only a good bugbear to frighten the tyrant.

*

*

*

The religious dispensation of the world demands religious monarchy. Such monarchy implies the need of moral symbolism centering round one man. If it is difficult to make one man good, just, and heroic, it is infinitely so to make heroes of thousands and millions. To vest the sovereignty in the people is thus perhaps the royal route to eliminate moral considerations.

*

*

*

The old fights, we are told, were on religious or personal grounds. Naturally, the moral ideals of the nations were always behind the wars. Wars were justifiable only on moral grounds wherein society found its strength and solace. Moral values were taken for granted and were

thought the worthiest objects for men, to lay down their lives. Moral values were not to be explored in the laboratories of moral wrecks.

* * *

You cannot make wars humane and just, after allowing the moral values to disappear under a materialistic philosophy of life.

* * *

It is a noteworthy characteristic of our age that the term "revolution" has come in for popularity. It has sought cover under the plea of tyranny of political authority while it has really and practically served for unhinging the moral, social and political order. The revolution is ultimately intended to be a revolt against all authority and for liberty to do every thing that the will dictates.

* * *

The tendency of the modern revolt against authority is towards a progress to barbarism. Society would not tolerate it even as much as it has done in these days, if it saw aright. All such revolt is usually initiated by intellectual malcontents, taken up by social *malafides*, and supported by the lowest elements in human nature.

* * *

The Frenchman who vociferated that there was no God because there was a great earthquake in Italy must be either a knave or a dunce. It must be confessed however, that he has a great following. If the misfortune of one person can be justified on the ground of his previous deeds, the same can be justified in the case of larger numbers. The *Shastric* theory of Karma and Transmigration

of the Soul gives the complete and convincing solution.

* * *

It is curious how irrationally even intelligent men receive their impressions in childhood or adolescence. What an argument for a Swami Dayānand to say that the idol (of Shiva) that could not save its rice from the rats would hardly save him. He forgot conveniently or wishfully that the image or the symbol was not God, it was *of* God. And why should the image, even if it could, play the enemy to the rat and uncalled for 'watch and ward' to the young Brahmin boy.

* * *

The Hindu worships God in the image as well as in the Brahmin, the Virgin, the Couple, the Tulsi plant, the Pippal tree, the cow, the horse, the plough, the threshold, the Sun, the moon, the river, the sea and so on. In effect he practically says that God is all-pervading and omnipresent. Such worship is man's truest tribute to God's omnipresence

* * *

The usages and practices of the Hindus are their best credentials. They are certainly different from those of the others. But to the intellectuals they are fountains of suggestions and symbolisms of the noblest philosophy woven in life. They only await inquiry.

* * *

The more wonderful thing is that a great philosophic attitude has taken hold of a whole people in India. They act as if the universe was God in macrocosm. Even an ape's or an ant's life is sacred to them. And in spite of

this, in purity of physical life, they are the most uncompromising Puritans.

*

*

*

It seems that the word 'democracy' is in fashion. They thrust it in for anything at their convenience. It is so often used to pander to the pride of the people or to excite them to particular activities. I think it is an insult to the intelligence those who are to be appealed to, and a poor testimony to the intelligence of those who make the appeal.

*

*

*

Who can rightly say that the British Commonwealth with its noble king, with its House of peers, spiritual and temporal, with its British Empire can be called a democracy ? At that rate, men may soon style as democracies those dictatorships which secure more than ninety percent of the people's vote. Why should a people, it can be said bind themselves to any particular system of a parliamentary character ? A democracy must be free to choose its own masters and why not free to decide their number, period and powers ?

*

*

*

The British constitution has been successful not on account of its democratic elements but in spite of them. Only the British statesmen know how the nightmare is pursuing them since they have caught the Tartar.

*

*

*

The Constitution of France has been since the Revolution but in a liquid condition. It is one of the most unsuccessful democracies, and its history after 1789

though boosted and boomed by the people concerned is but a tragedy of retribution for the ideals which it broadcast through the Revolution. The brightest features in its dark sky are the heroic personality of Napoleon and persisting Catholicism. Marshal Petain confessed publicly when he took the decision to sue for peace that amongst the French people the spirit of pleasure prevailed over the spirit of sacrifice.

* * *

The Constitution of the United States of America is considered by some to be an autocracy but even taking it at its face value who can say that the American democracy with its half a dozen presidents assassinated, with its gangsterism and lead in crime, and with its dollar-god, is a successful democracy advancing to an ideal state ?

* * *

The great truths of the sacred books can be easily denied, as we often see done, by a knave or a fool or an indifferentist. But they come home at the nick of time with compound interest.

* * *

You can say, what is there in Chastity, what in Charity or what in Austerity ? A world-war comes and opens up your eyes Nature rises up and says 'To you it was nothing, this flippancy in sexual or social life But you cannot escape the wheel of my dispensation' The devout and faithful parents leave the heritage of strength and fidelity to their children. The flippant parents leave the legacy of their failings and falterings Purity and austerity of life are not merely for the happiness of

the home but ultimately for the life and potency of the whole people.

* * *

France is ruined because it allowed the hegemony of the falsehoods of liberty, equality and democracy. Every nation that follows these falsehoods is on the road to self-destruction.

* * *

The British Government as already noted by us is a benevolent, religious, constitutional monarchy. It has donned the cloak of democracy unnecessarily. It has thereby invited communism and social disorder.

* * * *

The shibboleth has benefitted none. It has ruined the individual, the family and the nations that have made it their own. The problem of liberty is very simple, once you except the established religious values. If you ask for liberty for acting rightly, that is certainly yours in advance. And the cant becomes redundant. If you imply by it the liberty to do the wrong thing it deserves no implementing. Liberty in matters indifferent was never questioned.

* * * *

It is remarkable that on the one hand the Hindus believe in the ephemeral character of the worldly existence, their attitude towards the world on the other hand, while in the game, is of the most exalted type. They regard parents with the devotion due to gods, they honour the king as a father and give him oblations at their meals, they regard the cow as mother in token of their gratitude for receiving her milk. Birth, marriage,

death and even the daily prayers are to them solemn occasions. They are ambitious to fight the battles of life without ambition, for the sake of duty. Their whole life and its vision is sanctified by religion.

* * * *

Indeed Hinduism is the only religion that can make mankind virtuous, happy, exalted and absolved. But better an indifferent religion than none. We are in an age when the pristine religion can be hardly convenient to many people of the world. It is rather a troublesome and wearisome job for the easy-going people.

* * * *

Hinduism is not a proselytizing religion; naturally because it is the primordial religion. But this does not prevent any person or persons or even whole masses of men from following it. The great Manu points out that there are only four *Varnas*. The first three are the *Dwijas*, all the others are included in the fourth class. The religion of the Vedas was the religion of the human race.

* * * *

"We have got mastery over nature" say the protagonists of Science. In reality, they observe Nature, follow her rules, and get their results. This is rather obedience to nature. But like hen-pecks they invert the story. Presumption and vanity are ordinary man's old privileges. The wonder is that the so called intellectuals follow suit.

* * * *

Nature is not to be cowed down by these impostures.

She says "Come, Come, try your strength, you little pigmies. Let me first see how you fare with your fellows."

* * * *

Whetted intellect is like a surgeon's knife—dangerous every way except one. In the hands of an inexpert it gives a wound to the patient, while it gives a mischievous cut at the hands of a careless or misjudging expert. It is good only when it works right on the boil or the cataract. So also keen intellect is good only when it works in tune with God's law and dispensations, and against the cataract of atheism.

* * * *

With the gullibility of mankind and the fiction of equality advancing, there has been a mania for uniformity and for dealing with men by the mass method. The desire to deal *en masse* is the sign of inexperience and impatience while the chase for uniformity is an obsession. Nature is not uniform. Men, with all the efforts towards uniformity, will always try to have their peculiarities or specialities, each in his own way.

* * * *

We are often told that these Westerners mind the practical game. Yes, we say, we have seen these practical games. They will soon eliminate one another by mutual compliments of slaughter as in Europe. Not much waiting is needed for it. They have got it there within a hundred and fifty years. Nature's way also seems to be "cash against delivery", sometimes it is prepared also to lease and lend.

* * * *

No honest man should try to suppress the fact of inequality of human beings. It would amount to the suppression of the distinction of vice and virtue, ability and impotence, talents and dullness. The unjust may ask for the obliteration of these verities, to get unearned value, the just and honest cannot.

* * * *

We are told that there was choice-marriage in ancient times. But it seems that the choice-marriage of Sāvitrī or Seetā or Shakuntalā whose examples are well-known was that of choice by first sight or choice by valour. It was not a choice after trial caresses which amount to mental degradation. Somebody wrote a few days ago that "the progressive deterioration of the culture of Europe is traceable, to no small extent, to the profanation and commercialisation of womanhood."

* * * *

All great minds have to rise beyond nationalism or country-patriotism. In so far as such patriotism is stable, it is racial and cultural; but in so far as it is political it changes with dominating political boundaries and sometimes makes fools of its followers. A Burman was an Indian yesterday now he is a non-Indian War is a great juggler on that score. Routine Nationalism really is a makeshift for concentrating the people to a particular political *esprit de corps*. The glaring exposure of such a bond came out when Britain proposed the anglo-French fusion of nationalities just after Marshal Petain's suing for an armistice.

* * * *

There are some who make much of the seeming inconsistencies, enigmas and contradictions and unbeliability of the stories of the Shastras. The reply is threefold (1) everything is possible in the long vistas of time of millions of years which they cover (2) the scientific beliefs and decisions are so changing and changeable that no intelligent man should set a seal of impossibility to anything on *their* authority (3) the things can be understood properly only through the initiated. There we have verities of the Earth and the Heavens clothed or camouflaged properly to avoid the mischief of misuse.

* * * *

When we look at the wonderful art of Veda Vyāsa in the Mahābhārata or the Purānas, in presenting spiritual terrestrial, theological or physical truths, we simply stand amazed and say this cannot be a man's work. It is the superman alone who could have done it.

* * * *

Some people by casting slurs and abuses on our sacred books slyly mean to eke out the great secrets behind them. In so doing, they do justice neither to themselves nor to the aims behind the secrecy.

* * * *

Indeed the ancients were not more amazed at the so called miracles than the daily miracles of the life around. To them the very birth of a bird from the egg was a miracle pointing towards divinity.

* * * *

The great value of the sacred books is in the line of life they prescribe. They delineate life of the past only as an illustration either of good, bad or indifferent. As

the proof of the pudding is in eating, so the value of the Word Revealed is in its observance. Knowledge is power and knowledge was jealously guarded from evil hands by all ancients who knew its value for the benefit of the human race.

* * * *

The ironical humour of modern European conditions is that they do not like the old good things with the old good names. So they try other good names for the things that are. But the things that are, are so bad that the new good names soon get into a bad flavour. Religion, the old good article with good contents came first in their bad graces; so they chose the word Civilization. When men saw its contents, they began to say that civilization was a disease. The word Liberty came into popularity as suggesting freedom from the yoke of a foreign political power. It soon began to be misused to cover the impulse of rebellion against all authority political, moral or spiritual.

* * * *

A real 'liberal' is one whose sympathy with the human beings rather than liberties with morals, are wide.

* * * *

Progress and Evolution are a very convenient cover for propaganda and advertising; and by constant repetition the gullible masses seem to have swallowed them as unearned profits.

* * * *

The marriage ideal in India has been very high and noble. Wife is the man's very self; both of them believe it and their mutual rights and obligations spring from this

very understanding. He is ready to lay down his life for her and she would be ready to lay down her life unto him. It is this understanding which makes him impatient for her fidelity. Perhaps in rage he stabbs like Othello but the next moment he stabbs himself This may be carrying matters too far, but it is questionable whether the connivance of the other sort is more an asset of human life.

* * * *

In Europe something like International Law was observed till lately because nations followed Christian or religious ideals. With the ruin of religious ideals or their dethronment international law perished. It is only the God-given religious ideals that can bind all the nations.

* * * *

Democracy is not all men's rule. It is no-man's rule. A mixture of numerous colours allows none to keep its own. It results only in a dusty unknown.

* * * *

Libertinism is running riot some of these days. They talk of chains and bonds and freedom. And what are the chains that gall these men and women? They are the chains that bind man unto the State, the Society, and the Morals.

* * * *

India is verily a sub-continent It is, we are told, as large as Europe cum-Russia; it has a population one fifth of that of the world; it has more than a dozen nationalities and more than five hundred languages and dialects. It has mines of diamonds, gold, alluminium, mica and coal.

It has large water-basins, the highest mountains and miles of sea-coast.

* * * *

It is remarkable that political assassinations have of late been on the increase in Europe. In the olden times they waited even for the mock-show of trial to hang their kings. Nowadays they seem to be thinking this one to be a shorter cut. It shows the bitterness of enmities, the waning of public opinion and the anarchy in ethical standards

* * * *

There are numerous resemblances in the various sacred books of the world which have been noted by students of theosophical research. These go to support the idea of *unity of origin* of these religions.

* * * *

Faith in God's Word or Sacred Revelation cannot be overthrown logically by Science, which itself is shifting its ground from day to day. Thus it is that every man's faith in God-given religion is good for him and if he is intelligent enough, no arguments can dislodge him from his position.

* * * *

It has been rightly said that towards anything and everything it is the fundamental attitude that counts. If the teachers of human race succeed in teaching humanity that the worldly existence is an illusion and that the whole universe is but the sport of Brahman, the whole human life would be revolutionised. You act well if you know that it is an illusion; you feel well if you know that it is a play

* * * *

I wonder who found out the trick of the representative system. He must be the clever fellow who wanted to keep others quiet and to speak out himself in their name.

* * * *

We don't decide everything worth deciding by mere majority. In choosing a profession or a doctor or a lawyer or a Guru we lay weight not on the number but the quality of our advisers.

* * * *

In literature or life, in politics or polemics, in ethics or aesthetics wherever you go by the judgement of majority, by the rule of numbers, you invariably go down.

* * * *

Materialism may be clever enough as a philosophy but it is ruinous in its consequences in life. For the matter of that any philosophical speculation can be shown to be plausible by a clever exponent.

* * * *

It is with the speculative Philosophy that Religion is sometimes contrasted. "Philosophy" wrote Mallet Du Pan, "may boast of her reign over the country she has devastated. Her votaries hastened the degeneration and corruption of the French by weakening the bulwarks of morality, by sophisticating conscience and by substituting the uncertain dictates of man's fallible reason and the equivocations of selfishness, for rules of duty imposed by tradition, confirmed by education and secured by habit."

* * * *

Prof. Willert points out some of the fundamental axioms of the revolution: "All men are by nature equal. All have

the the same natural right to strive after happiness, to self-preservation, to the free control and disposal of their persons and prosperity, to resist oppression, to hold and express whatever opinions they please. The people is sovereign. It cannot alianate its sovereignty and every government not established with the free consent of the community is a usurpation. Reason is infallible and omnipotent. It can discover truth and compel conviction. Rightly consulted it will reveal to us that code of nature which should be recognised and enforced by civil laws. No civil enactment which violetes natural laws is valid. Nature meant men to be virtuous and happy. He is vicious and miserable because he transgress her laws and despises her teaching."

* * * *

This is practically also the modern philosophy of life and it has ruined man's home, his society and made barbarians of human beings and given a blood-bath to Europe.

* * * *

This philosophy bears evidently the hall-mark of impaired vision, imagination running riot, hopeless logic and wishful thinking. Is it possible to trace such doctrines to the vitiating and paralysing influence of alcoholic drinks which have already made a baneful effect on the thoughts and life of Europe ?

* * * *

The deleterious effect on their brains must be recognised when they could not see the patent fact that men are unequal or that men are not by nature free or that the

headship or sovereignty precedes the crowd, the family, the race and the people. Man was bound up by a veneir of skin even when he came to this world and it was the human being that made him free. He was dependent upon his mother for his very life and sustenance. He was dependent upon man for learning to stand up and walk about this earth. It was man who taught him the art of speech for misusing which he now claims liberty. These facts are so patent that they challenge contradiction.

* * * *

Freedom of speech and action is common among the lower animals. The result is that they can form herds only. They run after their impulses and emotions. Instinct is their only guide and 'Might is Right' is their sole law.

* * * *

Montaigne is said to have drawn from his conviction that human reason cannot attain to truth and that every argument may be met by another equally cogent, that to make reason arbiter in social and political questions must lead to anarchy and that therefore a wise man will not weaken the force of custom and tradition, the foundation and the strength of all laws and institutions.

* * * *

The ancient State was a Totalitarian State but it was a religious monarchy. The laws were established by religion while the king was the executive head of the State for protecting the laws and the people.

* * * *

Hinduism is perhaps the most tolerant religion in the world. The reason seems to be that it is the parent religion. It has looked like a parent, guardian or patron towards other religions, and yet it has always maintained its integrity and identity. The ethics of Hinduism are so high and cosmopolitan that Hindu supremacy has been safe for all other religions. This can hardly be said of other religions.

* * * *

Their is much in the sacred books of Hinduism, nay even of all religions, which appears rather difficult to understand or harmonise with some of our present notions. The difficulty is common with all works which are ages apart, and with events which are not in the normal line of things.

* * * *

The whole position of the moderners is that our present findings in science and *sophia* (or wisdom) are the standards to judge all ages. The true and complete answer to the position is that they are not. So the modern idea that the old things are wrong or impostures or benevolent bluffs, are subject to the *ab initio* fallacy of false or unreliable *measures*.

* * * *

Philosophies have changed under man's regime. Science has been shifting its grounds and theories from day to day. Greatest logicians have wisely ruled out all human reasoning as merely relative and tentative as compared to the higher fundamentals beyond its reach.

* * * *

When we read the sacred books of the ancient religions we may do well to remember that they are presentations of Truth in its various aspects in various guises in the human language, covering the Whole Universe.

* * * *

The sooner we realise the character of crucial movements, the better for the human race. No movements can be on all fours alike. It is the tendency or the forces which they create that ultimately counts. Those who are on the side of religion in practical life as well as in ideals must be taken to be on the right side.

* * *

Mere Nationalism or secular Nationalism in so far as it accepts a non-moral material ideal is on the wrong clue. So also is Democracy which is a negation of all principles except that of the show of hands.

* * *

The congress is reaping the fruits of a materialistic ideal. Hence it is gradually sliding towards the communistic forces. When the religious communities are dis-recognised, Communism is the compact social theory which readily takes the field. Man-made morals based on the convenience and assent of majority give way at the slightest touch, like a house of cards.

* * *

Some people in order to avoid any restraints of the intellect and compunctions of conscience have invented the theory of changing or rather ever-changing morals and religion. At the bottom of this view also, is the disbelief in God and His Moral Law. If the Law is there and

is known to man there should be no difficulty in regarding it as good and true for all time. If we have to depend on men for a moral code the distrust is but natural.

* * *

There is nothing in untouchability to make people create such a bow-vow. The effects of contacts are perhaps too well-known to all—to young and advanced alike, to be noted in detail. Also well-known are the effects of the contacts of the higher with the lower, the virtuous with the depraved, the rotten with the ripe. Social contacts induce sex contacts and the latter induce hereditary traits and diseases

* * *

"I cast my eyes over Europe" said M. A. Valdis the great Spanish writer and critic "and I see nothing in poetry and painting but lugubrious and prosaic scenes, and in music I hear nothing but sounds of death" His premonition has been verified.

* * *

The question in these days is who should formulate the constitution. A cynic would say. "Not man, at any rate." Men have made a mess of it everywhere. France after 1789 A.D. has devised half a dozen constitutions which all have failed.

* * *

A Constituent Assembly is just the wrong thing for making a constitution. It is wrong in principle. It gives plenary powers to an unknown mixture of groupings, fights and consequences. It is the Nemesis of the doctrine: "Numerical Might is Right.

* * *

When people will have more experience of Democracy, I think they will fly from it to Monarchy, which is less tyrannical than Dictatorships and less wasteful than Democracies.

* * * *

The man who surrenders himself to the principle of Democracy gives himself up and his principles, in advance, to the dictation of others. He is in the minority of one to millions

* * * *

Democracy is a trick to impose upon the vain who do not and cannot really rule, to persuade them that they are the rulers. Thus inflated they are gagged and squeezed as no Monarchy can ever do.

* * * *

The greatest mischief of Democracy is that it makes for shams and trickery in the whole public life. It lives on half-truths and whole fictions, on *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi* as the only convenient methods and shields of its impostures.

* * * *

“No taxation without representation” said the new enthusiast. “Oh, certainly, you will have plenty of both and more” replied the politician. And here we are.

* * * *

Democracies are the breeding-ground of the worst forms of *laissez-faire* and indirectly of worst crimes and passions. It is noteworthy that gangsterism and nudist dances began in U. S. A. and France.

* * * *

"India is such a strange land and Hindus have such a strange culture" some say. But this is verily so. Ours is the main original Volume with laws, bye-laws, exceptions and commentaries. The others are convenient summaries, more in vogue but less authentic.

* * * *

Some people make a fad of attacking the Hindu usage of Suttee going on the funeral pyre of her husband. The answer is simple. Men admire self-sacrifice for the country, self-sacrifice for religion, self-sacrifice for fame, self-sacrifice for fidelity to the master or even self-sacrifice in combating a robber. This is self-sacrifice to the ideal of womanly love, fidelity and chastity which are the noblest parts of womanhood.

* * * *

To a scientific mind it is as presumptuous to disbelieve a thing which is out of its experience, as it would be for a man of the fifteenth century to disbelieve in aeroplanes or wireless telegraphy.

* * * *

The Vedas as divine, primordial and prehistoric Revelation are embodied in words with their basic meanings. They are as difficult to scan as the Ways of God. They are like the sun from which we can receive the Light without taking its measure.

* * * *

The initial error is in disregarding the given chronology and forgetting that the Shastras narrate things of lacs of years ago. The great king Rāmchandra of epic fame lived according to the Rāmāyana in the Tretā Yuga.

i. e. before about a million years. It should be a tip to the scientist that in that distant epoch men had psychic power commanding physical objects, that there were animals with vocal powers greater than to-day and that there were several other arts and powers which are unknown to-day.

* * * *

The history in the Puranas is not merely the history of our globe, it is the history of the Universe. It embraces the history of stellar entities, seen with Yogic Vision. Manu and Dhruva are the denizens of the skies.

* * * *

I would not like to confine the interpretations of the Purānas by this or that theory. I only mean that there is plenty of scope for interpretations as well as plenty of valuable material of history, sociology, philosophy and science in the sacred books of the Hindus. If anything that we have in writing about distant human affairs, deserved the faith of mankind it is these sacred works.

* * * *

The sacred works of the Hindus need not be put in juxtaposition with the sacred works of other religions, The latter are either undisputedly more recent or without such historical details.

* * * *

The Interpretation of the Purānas is not so easy as a modern short story. They represent the history of the Universe on several planes of life. The history is spasmodic and strange because it is selective universal and revealed.

* * * *

The western people are much intrigued with the usage of untouchability in India. The fact is that all religions lay stress on purity, hereditary and mental as well as physical or corporal. Only Hinduism has gone deep enough to strengthen the usages in this matter. The touch of unclean things and persons of uncleanly callings are to be avoided by those on a higher scale of cleanliness and purity. If contact has its effects and if unclean effect should be avoided, no arguments are needed to persuade people that men who are following the profession of an uncleanly nature and are in that heredity, may be avoided for the sake of social well-being. The callings are better settled by heredity than by other accidents of life.

* * * *

The Hindus are not to be measured with the rule and line of other races or nations. No nation can stand with them in the longevity of culture, continuity of life, uniqueness of social solidarity and excellence of political ideals, exemplified throughout history; This a matter of not so much of pride as of facts.

* * * *

Why is there this purdah-system, or this keeping apart of the males and the females, in India? This is a common question. The answer is that the sexes have a natural attraction which cannot be denied; that the consequences of free contacts and free mixings have been highly detrimental to morals both in Europe and America is also admitted. The whole question turns on how much emphasis you want to put on Chastity in human life. Whether you mean it or no, the consequence in such

mixed society is the same. And the ultimate result is that the sanctity of the home and the peace of human life stand to be ruined.

* * * *

If the state is to move according to the shifting opinions of a heterogeneous multitude, voting on a haphazard local grouping, no religious community can be safe.

* * * *

Liberty is very often the demi-god of sensualists who use it as a camouflage to hide their weaknesses.

* * * *

Democrat—Come one, come all, in my fold.

Others—But suppose, we differ in principles ?

Democrat—Does not matter. We hold none but that of number.

* * * *

Egalitarian—We are all equal, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Dick—(To himself) That is very good. Jane cannot now refuse. I and Tom are equals.

* * * *

Secularisation of politics would ultimately mean eschewing of all religions and religious considerations from politics. But religion and the society guided by it, are basic verities for conserving which politics was invented. Accepting of communities on their own principles is the only way to preserve the cultural freedom of the homogeneous social groups.

* * * *

Religion gives the machinery of manufacture in this big World-Mill and politics should supply the mechanism

of power. In the machinery there may be different departments as of spinning, colouring, weaving and finishing; so also there can be different nationalities and communities all working in their own lines and yet in unison for the advantage of the whole.

* * *

In this World-Mill we people are individual workmen who may make mistakes of slip or slide or sloth. The machine may suffer by it but may be set right by engineers. It would be no good gathering all the workmen in an assembly and to hand over to them the machine for repair.

* * *

It is as absurd to hope for unity and harmony through general electorates and democracy as to hope for unity and harmony by keeping together all the animals of the Zoo in one big enclosure.

* * * *

Some big writers of the modern times have prided upon our age being more intelligent and judicious than all the rest. This would be a pardonable vanity if they did not make that assumption the corner-stone of their arch of faith. The sign of vanity run riot is to assume and pretend to be all-wise. That is the attitude of many a modernist. He does not even think that God and His Word exist.

* * . * *

Aristotle puts down democracy as the worst form of government by the many, and perhaps rightly. The man who acquiesces in the principle of democracy is but

a slave in anticipation. He signs, in advance, the death-warrant of his principles when he accepts to go as the majority may decide.

* * * *

The secular nationalist would wish to submerge all communities into a national merger; the religious nationalist would allow them to progress on their own lines.

* * * *

Communities are big social groups based on religious conformity or uniformity. Why should they be regarded as *out of order* ? They have as much right to exist and unite as any other groups with other ideals of life.

* * * *

A Godless nationalism gradually drifts towards and makes way for Godless communism.

* * * *

The basic falsehoods of democracy are (1) " All men are equal " (2) The majority judges better (3) The majority will safeguard the minorities (4) The results of the ballot-box are good for the whole people (5) One man can properly represent a big lot of people on a number of important problems (6) There is no Divine dispensation for mankind, so, men may do as *they* like,

* * * *

The new intellectuals have been writing cheques on the bank of Human Gullibility Unlimited and the cheques are usually honoured, provided they are in good style and not too big for the bank's funds.

* * * *

With the discrediting of 'God's revelations this mounting has been the common order of the day. The old writers were afraid lest their productions may sully the face of Truth. But our new imposters, having banished anything like reliable permanent truth out of their province, can launch any theory or opinion. The greater the impostor the more imposingly preposterous is his position. If God is nothing to him what to talk of religion ?

* * * *

These impostors indeed do not count for long, for they are soon outstripped in their art which requires more wits than wisdom and more 'cuteness than character. Of cuteness and wit there is no dearth in the modern world.

* * * *

I wonder how strangely people evaluate things I have seen people who are fastidious to a fault in ordering their drawing-rooms and yet who are frivolous enough in ordering their life. Then there are men who can tell you the latest Railway-timings but have devoted no thought to timing their own life.

* * * *

Faith is the logic of life, Reason is the logic of wishes.

* * * *

The Vedas are, so to say, God's Broadcast of general principles, the Smritis are codified Law therefrom by covenanted sages, the Puranas present the traditional practices or case law and precedents The conscience looks to the personal conditions and gives the ruling in details.

* * * *

It is a tribute to religion that even bad things are defended on the ground of those great virtues which religion upholds. The new Benevolence and Puritanism of modern times is a hybrid of Respect for virtue and Propensity for vice. While the Respect lives, it pretends to legislate like a highbrow Virtuoso; and when it dies it hugs the vice by way of natural reaction. So it happened in the times of Cromwell and Charles II, so also at the time of the French revolution and thereafter.

* * * *

So also it has happened in India. The cloak of reform and puritanism was first used to attack the lives of Shree Krishna and the gods and goddesses. It reviled the injustice of the *purda* and censured the practice of public dances. They are now compensating for those scruples by bringing in dances and songs of Shri Krishna, by making a fashion of freedom of intercourse between men and women, and by creating conditions in which girls are more exposed to weaknesses and vice.

* * *

The regrettable feature of the modern times is that sub-consciously people have assimilated false standards of judgement. The old people were much cleverer that way. The rogue who set down good peoples as fools was not considered astute by them. He was put down at his proper value. They knew well that the scales with which men weigh the things before them exhibit the measure of their own mental condition.

* * *

It was considered an insult to womanhood to view

woman as an object of lust, in ancient times. Woman was representative of benign and chaste Motherhood. Even to-day 'mai' is the epithet with which the ascetic addresses every woman and the speaker harangues a multitude of women.

* * * *

In a war, whether large or small, the greatness consists in understanding it to be a fair play. If you do that you will not act disgracefully, you will not return a blow malevolently, you will not be pulled down if defeated, and you will not be elated if victorious. You know that it is a sport, you dine with your ere long rivals and sleep down the night in peace.

* * * *

They are dupes who believe that their can be an end to all wars and they are knaves who merely say so. The whole problem is how to lessen wars and make war tolerable, equitable and humane in its principles and outfit. No man-made laws can solve this problem. Mankind must have a faith in ideals superior to those of power, pounds and pleasures

* * * *

The idea of equality puts men on the wrong track. Titles, positions and advantages as well as qualifications, soon begin to be looked upon with jealousy, the common weakness of the mediocre and vulgar. Not being quite in a position to challenge these things with arguments and justice they join in ridiculing, censuring and revolting against them.

* * * *

"Here are the portraits of those who took the vows and were saved; but where are the portraits of those" scoffed the Disbeliever, an old story tells us, "who took the vows and were drowned" The answer could have been given that they were in the chamber of his imagination.

*

*

*

Saint Peter and the rest of them preached the threefold duty of charity, austerity, and purity, and secured for generations the peace and prosperity of Europe. The revolutionists of France preached Liberty, Equality, and Democracy and in consequence led their leaders to the guillotine and the people into deterioration and defeat.

*

*

*

The world was never a heaven, and is not likely to be. But it is the new doctrines that have made a hell of it within the the last hundred and fifty years. Even science and industrialism are not responsible for this condition; they are passive things after all. It is the mind which uses them well or ill and that mind has to be mended. No artifices to confound it or to confine it will do after you tell it that "*Liberty* be your way of life." It is intelligent enough to question: Why so far and no further?

FINIS

CONSERVATIVE INDIA
PART II
SAYS & ESSAYS

The Central Fact of Philosophy

Philosophy to the ancients was the solace of life, to the
moderns, it is almost a solecism. To the

What is ancients it was the Soul of Knowledge, to
Philosophy ? the moderns, it is a loose anklet, perhaps
an unnecessary hurdle in her race. How has
it been so ? What is the proper position of Philosophy in
Knowledge ?

“There are more things in heaven than are dreamt of
in your philosophy, Horatio !” says Hamlet

Decline of (who is himself a bit of a philosopher)
Philosophy making light of philosophy. Philosophy, had,
by the time of Shakespeare been synonymous
with speculative thinking. Even in early Greece and Rome,
Philosophy paraded as a heretic against the truths of Divinity.
Philosophy is sometimes even looked down upon. “Every union
of Philosophy and Religion” says Dr. George Salmon, “is the
marriage of the mortal with the immortal The religion lives,
Philosophy grows old and dies.” It seems that the status of
Philosophy in Europe has gone on declining until philosophy
has in modern times climbed down to serve merely as an intel-
lectual discipline. “Many men” says Bertrand Russel “under
the influence of science or practical affairs are inclined to doubt
whether Philosophy is anything better than innocent but useless

trifling." The Jesuits, we are told, came to regard modern philosophy as the "pathology of human reason." "Thank God" says the cynic, "I am not a philosopher."

In the East, Philosophy has been more in harmony with Religion and has found greater favour and reverence. It was the *finale* of the Vedas and the fundamental basis of Buddhism.

The realisation of the Absolute philosophic Truth has been considered by the oriental, the highest goal of life here and hereafter. Philosophy has not danced to the dictates of the Knight-Errant-*the Human Will*-but the latter has become knight-attendant to Philosophy. The divergence in the fates of Philosophy in the East and in the West is remarkable. The reason of the variation, it seems, lies in the conception of Philosophy there, which seems to have been solid in the beginning, made liquid later on, and promises fair to evaporate so perfectly as to elude our grasp, in course of time.

We are inclined to enquire how it is that Philosophy seems to have lost its hold on the human mind.

Why on Is it because as compared to the Empirical
the Wane ? truths of Science, the generalizations of philosophy seem too hazy and nebulous ?

Is it because as compared with the so called linear progress of Science, the movement of Philosophy seems to have been in contrary directions or round and round in a circle ? Is it that the practical outlook of modern life does not much care to trouble itself about generalizations relating to space, time, spirit and soul ? Is it because the man of to-day has become so engrossed in his struggle for existence that he satisfies himself with any patch-work Philosophy of Life that he needs and finds on his way ? Is it because in spite of our aspirations for a

greater and a fuller knowledge we have been so entangled in the smaller bits of cognitions, that we can hardly extricate ourselves for a greater and nobler realization of the whole? Or is it because at the present stage of human history men are so obsessed by the materialistic view of life that any thing beyond this life and its sensations has ceased to make a serious appeal to them?

It is possible that all these considerations might partly have been responsible for bringing about the new state of affairs. But those paramount considerations, which make men look up to Philosophy have not ceased. Man remains a conscious Being with a vision beyond this life in spite of the suggestion that he is merely a conscious automaton. He feels his own self as the centre without which he could not have thought of the world or Universe. The life within and around him is a maze and a mystery, in spite of all the namings and explanations of Science. He feels an aspiration within him which refuses to be satisfied with tentative theories, sensuous pleasures and the materialistic vision of life. These circumstances make man long for a Philosophy and if he does not find a Philosophy worthy of the name he patches up for himself a Philosophy of his life. It may be a philosophy drawn from religion or sub-consciously sucked up from literature. It may be his own handi-work in speculation, or it may be derived from his faith in the wisdom of a Plato or a Kant or a Russel.

How is it, then, that Philosophy which was the highest object—the *summum bonum* of life—has come to be discredited or neglected? The reason, seems to lie in the acceptance of a wrong concept of Philosophy. Philosophy under hands good, bad, and indifferent has lost its moorings.

Philosophy, I submit, is the Science of Absolute Truth. Absolute-truth indeed, cannot but be precious and difficult to attain; but fortunately for man there are 'kindly lights' which illumine his path. The trouble with the average modern thinker is that he is too much entangled in life and letters to see his way through, and he unavoidably seeks solace in what Bacon called "the twilight of truth." If we knock at the door, there is likelihood that it shall be opened unto us. Surely we need not be in the mood of Pilate who asked what is Truth, and did not wait for the reply. Nor need we be in the Nelsonian attitude of the agnostic who turns his blind eye towards the signal he does not want to obey. What then shall be the line of our search?

Philosophy, we say, is axiomatic Truth; it excludes individual speculations on the one hand and tentative uncertainties on the other.

Pure and Absolute Truth It is possible indeed that transcending as it does, all antecedent convictions, prejudices and predilections, such a philosophy may not be grasped without a previous necessary discipline and sufficient insulation of the mind from interested digressions, but the logicity of it must be absolute. The 'I' which embraces the universe, but for which the universe has no existence, and which can never be realized as non-existent, is the central and absolute fact of philosophy. 'I exist', though a tautology of Truth is the Axiom of philosophy. 'I perceive something' is the general statement of experience. It is the Postulate of Philosophy. 'This 'something' is changing and evanescent'-that is the analysis of experience. It means that the postulated object of perception or experience is not an absolute Reality. To philosophy the definition of Truth or Reality is that it is absolutely true. That which is absolutely true or absolutely real must be undisturbed by time, place, or conditions. It must be unchangeable and permanent.

If it is not permanent it cannot be demonstrable and realizable at all times. Absolute Reality must be ever-realizable. Thus 'I exist' is the only residual fact of philosophy and it discounts the value of all the varied experiences of the 'I' as evanescent phantasmagoria.

This central fact and its vindication is the permanent function of philosophy. It is a fact which **Central Fact of** is not emphasized by Science because not **Philosophy** the perceiver but the perceived falls within the pervuew of Science. Science perhaps by implication takes the perceiver for granted but it is the business of philosophy to assert and announce the same. This is the only valid fact of what we may properly call philosophy. All other statements pertain to the changing universe. They are not valid in an absolute sense. They are not true for all time, place, and experience unto me—the Perceiver or Knower. They come and go. The knower or if you choose to say, 'the consciousness' persists. An objection may arise that the individual consciousness may perish. It is hazardous to say that it does. How do you say it does? On whose evidence? But the issue is not pertinent to our position. We consider the consciousness—the 'I' that sees others dying; not the object that dies. I cannot and I need not forget that the whole universe lives and dies before me, unto me and through me. The knower is the central pivot of all knowledge, opinion or belief. Further, it must be said that neither the mind nor the senses constitute this pure ego. It is the pure consciousness that abides when I am asleep or dreaming or awake. *Cogito Ergo Sum* said Descartes but even Cogitation is not the constituent attribute of pure Ego. It is the mind which cogitates, the pure Ego is beyond the mind. We may posit three facts about this 'Ego' or 'Consciousness' which are almost axiomatic. Firstly that it exists,

secondly that it experiences. This Consciousness or Being is absolute Reality. It asserts itself even in its denial. If I say that I do not exist, I only testify that I do. This Ego, we may say, is the irreducible minimum of existence. It is not the perturbing, oscillating mind, or the changeable intellect but that which witnesses their ramifications and evolutions. It is not the personality which is bound down by hide and bone but the essence that transcends the person. It is not certainly the matter which it sees and seems to modulate or govern. It is that which gives whatsoever sort of validity belonging to the world of experience.

This concept of philosophy differentiates it from Epistemology because it concerns itself not with the vision of knowledge, but with the fact of the Knower. It is far away from Logic for it seeks not to regulate thought but simply posits the Thinker. In fact, it concerns itself with the irreducible minimum of Truth or Reality. Neither Aesthetics nor Ethics can form part of such a philosophy; for Aesthetics deal with the changing and changeable forms and Ethics deal with the conduct of a complex organism which we call "man." It is not concerned fundamentally even with "the Meaning of the Universe" which according to Hotze, is the quest of Philosophy.

The great adversary, that seems to have ousted Philosophy, in modern times, is Science. We have already anticipated and assessed this Knight-Errent Science & Philosophy. in relation to our theory. But really speaking, it is not Science that is fighting Philosophy. The realms of both are independent of each other. But it is the materialism which informs most of the modern scientific speculation, that has thrown philosophy in the

background. We may note here that it would be an error to confound science with materialism. Science is merely an analysis of present facts worked out by a process of synthesis into general tentative rules useful in practice. Such science existed in a way in olden times and in a way exists also to-day. Materialism is on the other hand a speculative philosophy ostensibly claiming to speak about fundamentals but really presuming to give direction to human life. It is this vital difference which makes thoughtful men condemn Materialism without condemning Science. Science is a serviceable attendant of the human race, but Philosophy whether of God or men or anti-christ, is a master that gives it guidance in Life. Men are naturally very particular that they should not have an unreliable guide and they are more particular that it should not be a mis-leading guide. It has incidentally happened that some portion of the human race as well as some individual scientists have been receiving their clue from the philosophy of Materialism and have been way-laid both in life and longings. But really speaking, science in the proper sense of the term as an intelligent synthesis of the present experience is morally neutral. It is knowledge of facts—though knowledge of an inferior order because of its tentative character. In so far as its hypotheses and theories are concerned, they may be in or out of tune with religion, according to the mentality and initial inspirations of the scientists of an age or a country.

Materialism is as unreliable as any other speculative philosophy and as unassailable as any system. **Materialism** in the hands of intellectuals. It is unreliable because its assumptions and postulates are unwarranted, because, most of it is speculative hypothesis and because most of its evidence is incomplete, changing and tentative. On the other hand, it is unassailable like any doctrine in the

hands of intellectuals; because nothing on such fundamental issues can be proved and nothing can be disproved. Against any doctrine an intellectual can be secure by questioning its fundamental hypothesis, its major premises and the veracity of its definitions. There is much loose-thinking to-day in Philosophy as well as in Science because the principles are not put in the form of definitions, axioms, postulates, problems and theorems. If these were to be properly exacted, the hollowness of all the so called modern scientific theories as well as philosophical systems would at once be exposed. We can only say as we have suggested above, that materialism stands *unproved*. "When people " Dr. Jevones humorously observes " talk about matter, are you quite sure what they are talking about ?" Kant has noted that the material are mental phenomena. Mr. Balfour also reiterates the empirical Truth that the 'evidence of the sense is not a foundation of belief'

There are some people who lay stress on experience as the basic factor of philosophy. " It is from
Philosophy experience", says Dr. Jevones, " that philo-
 & sophy has to start and it is on experience and
Experience the things experienced that philosophy has to
 reflect ". All knowledge indeed is correlated
 with experience, but there are experiences and experiences. Science has to do with sense-experience, Psychology has to do with mental experience, while Philosophy has to do, we may say, with fundamental and permanent experience of the Being.

Philosophical Truth, we are told, is much disturbed by the anxieties of Theologians. there are
Philosophy some who are for regarding philosophy as a
 & lesser light than religion. There are those who
Religion would recommend their divorce There are
 others who believe in their cordial union and

primordial identity. Considerations of the utility of the philosophy as a means to Religion, looms largely in the mind of Spinoza or in the so called Irrational Philosophy of the great mystic Bergson, and they have by way of reaction drawn forth equally ardent protests from such writers as Bertrand Russell and Dr. Radhakrishnan.

We can hardly review here even summarily the bearing of the attitudes of Kant or of the Utilitarians **Function of** Idealists, Positivists or the new Realists on the **Philosophy** position taken above Philosophy from our **reviewed** standpoint is neither the criticism of experience, laying down the conditions of its possibility, nor an attempt 'to evolve an idea of humanity with Ethical perfection at its core'. It is not a means to the sharpening of the knife intellectual nor a chronicler of human speculations. It is neither the hand-maid of religion nor the Indexer-in-chief of Science. Not the universe but the purest 'I' is the central Theme of Philosophy. Absolute Truth alone is its sovereign Realm. It is not the Science of Sciences, but Science beyond the Sciences.

It is high time that we should think of disentangling Philosophy from the labyrinthian channels of **Conclusion** tentative speculations. We should, to use the frivolities of letters in the realms of metaphysics, only welcome the marriage of Philosophy with Truth after her wanderings in quest of her Love. But further there is another advantage. As soon as Philosophy presents the great Absolute Truth in its isolated grandeur, science as the interpreter of the visionary universe also finds its own level by comparison. We soon realize that the subjective 'I' is the sovereign of the objective 'it' which he interprets by his varying lights.

Philosophy and Science cease to quarrel and to look askance. And even Religion rears up its drooping head, for while it was thinking of the 'I', science slipped in and said 'Let alone your "I" here I will show miracles'. Philosophy intervenes and says:—"Aye, Sir, but You are the miracle of miracles—the true Shekinah —no not your mind or your intellect or your imagination, but your very self which is behind all and beyond all, impenshable and infinite."



The Spheres of Science & Philosophy

• I am not much of a philosopher, and less of a scientist, but I may make it just the excuse for me
Introductory to speak on both. We are on the neutral zone and are not steeped too much in any to lose sight of the other. We know a bit of science, but have philosophy enough to perceive that science is all bits. We know something of philosophy, but have science enough to see that all intellectual speculation is not philosophy.

Defining science and philosophy would involve their delimitation—fixing up of their boundaries; but it is
Method of not in that way that we seek to confine their
Approach spheres. We may be prepared to examine their contents and then analyse their character or nature. Therein we escape the risk of arbitrary definitions which would lead us into the pitfalls of *petitio principii*. We would further examine these regions in the dry light of common sense rather than the deep recesses of technicalities.

* Essay read at the Indian Philosophical Congress. (Session XIII) on 16th Dec. 1937 at Nagpur.

What is it that science tells us ? Let us take up concrete instances. When the scientist says that the negative and positive electricities in certain juxta-position produce a spark or that light travels at the rate of so many miles per second or that the force of gravitation is in proportion to the mass, or that Hydrogen and Oxygen when chemically combined form water,—what does he exactly mean ? He defines,—rather determines the objects for his practical purposes, and notes them in certain relationships or activities and records the results in his own accepted terms. His basis is the present perception and he is pinned down to its principles so completely and faithfully that if the present perception gives different results, he is prepared to modify his belief accordingly. *The evidence of the actuality* is thus the very basis of science. If the actuality is otherwise, no scientist would insist that the old belief is true. He might strive to show that the actual is interpretable on the old belief; Or that there is a mistake in noting the actual, but he would never hold the one as true when it is not interpretable as in conformity with the other. The actual present therefore, we take it, is the sphere proper of science for it marks its boundary line.

We here do not deny that science *tries* to lay down laws and principles on the basis of its observations and that those laws and principles are often found to be applicable or justifiable in proximate times, places, and conditions. The most complicated-law of scientific observation is however in the same category as a primitive piece of empirical knowledge such as that 'fire burns'. It is equally based on observation and physical experience and has to be equally amended with variation in experience. Every scientist with every other

sane being is prepared to do so. In fact in doing so lies his strength. If he does not alter his theory in the light of new and differing experience, he becomes a back number.

This position leads us into three natural deductions or implications. Firstly being measured by **Implications of every new circumstance of time, place and Scientific Dicta** conditions, *science or scientific principles are tentative*, and being tentative they cannot be a final measure of truth or reality. Secondly, science is *derived* from the actuals, it is not the *determinant* of actuals. In a thousand cases the sun or the gun might answer your predictions, but in one it may not and you have to take it sitting or thinking or protesting or wondering as you like. Thirdly every thing beyond facts in relation to substances is not science but the Scientist's surmise or interpretation. Pure science is a statement of present facts conditioned by specific time, space and circumstances, as observed or observable in experience. Assertion about past or future is but speculation.

Let us further analyse what this means. I see a number of skeletons arranged in a scientific museum side by side, one differing a littlewise from its next. **Speculation in Science** The scientist says, they are so similar and there is a gradation in their difference, and we agree that it is so. But when he pretends to persuade me on the basis of the similarity that, therefore the one type was begotten of the other, I demur and say, 'That's no part of your business to determine. You may speculate but we will take it as such and nothing more.' Or to take another instance, the scientist may say under what conditions an embryo is formed. But as soon as he says that it cannot be formed otherwise and denies the possibility of auto-genesis, I doubt his credentials. His urge

there, is his faith, not his science. For, his science would change its face as soon as the event occurs. It cannot admit any compromises with his old faith. He has simply to say 'yes, it seems in these particular circumstances, auto-genesis is possible.' So much then as regards science.

Now let us turn to philosophy. Philosophy by its accredited acceptances, means the knowledge of the
The Meaning of Absolute Truth, Wisdom about the Reality.

Philosophy Some say philosophy is gymnastics of the Intellect. It may be *their* philosophy and it may be so with its function. But we cannot be kicked out of philosophy in that way. We want truth, we need truth, and we cannot allow it to be shuffled out of count by an artifice of expression. Some regard philosophy as the science of sciences or the knowledge co-ordinating all knowledges. But the co-ordination may be right or wrong. The virtue lies not merely in co-ordination but in its truth. Mere co-ordination would be a poor aim, and it would be a wider science, not philosophy. In that event, philosophy would be a weather-cock, turning its face with every breeze of a new co-ordination, and the pulls and pushes of every new great discovery. We take it therefore that philosophy is, as commonly understood, the knowledge about Truth—about Absolute Truth: for, it is no truth which is not ever true.

Taking this stand then, we have again to examine the passports. Who can find out the absolute
The Source of Truth? Surely not the finite, the frail and
Philosophy the fallible. The philosophising of the fallibles is not philosophy. It is philosophical-speculation. Philosophy or the Knowledge of Truth can come

only from the Omniscient. for the bulworks of truth extend to eternity in time and space. Whether there is any such presentation of truth, is another question. But we can rely only upon it, provided such a one there be. All other philosophy is really and without doubt intellectual gymnastics, where nobody is any the wiser by traversing centuries. And the co-ordination if there be any arrived at by these, is but a compromise with the current opinions. When such philosophy or rather speculation rises to the pose of Truth as in Socrates, it might meet with any doom that public opinion devises. It would be beside our point to suggest that it cannot save or solace a Soul. For, by its very genesis, it is unreliable. Such philosophies might be, as they have usually been, challenged and summarily passed over for a new feat. Philosophy then, in the proper sense of the term, we may regard as the presentation of Truth—Absolute and as such it can proceed from the Omniscient only.

It is not for us here to determine whether there is such a philosophy and which it is, if any. Or **Probable Signs** to put forth evidence for this or that system which is claimed to have been derived from the Omniscient. It stands to reason, however, and to common sense that the Being that created in man such great desire to know the truth, might have given it to him in His grace: that if it were given it must have been given in the beginning of human annals: that if it were given unto man, it must have been preserved with the assiduity and exactitude which such precious treasure would deserve; and that if it were preserved, it would give strength, certainty and sweetness to those who lived by its light.

Thus it seems to me that Science speaks and can speak legitimately only of things that it has examined, **Conclusion** that it can speak only of the present facts and things or their conditions and relations, and that it can speak but tentatively. I also realise that Absolute Truth is the sphere of Philosophy, that man-made philosophy is unreliable human speculation, that it cannot determine the absolute and eternal truth and that Philosophy true and reliable can come from the Omniscient only.



The Indian Social System: Its Basis and Evolution.

One of the great objects of meeting together in such an International Congress is to realize the **Introductory** spiritual affinity of the Human Race and to rightly understand and interpret the great heritage of the East. As all mankind is but kith and kin and its real problems much the same all over the world such understanding of the Mind, Motives and Moves of the East—would mean more light and less heat. It is but proper that such a Congress be held under the patronage of H. M. The King of Italy whose great Representative Il Duce said in his speech on the Capitole on the 22nd December 1932 that “The union of East and West was the corner stone of our entire history” and in Rome which “received in her Pantheon the gods of the most remote and the most diversely coloured nations.” We hope that such a congress may render some help to restore the equilibrium of the world which has already been so much disturbed.

In the present great crisis of world—ideas, few subjects are more interesting than the social systems **A Subject of** under which man has lived and the Indian **Vital Interest** Social System affords a study of unique interest, on account of its vastness, vitality,

*(Paper presented before the XIX International Congress of Orientalists at Rome. 23-29th Sept. 1935.)

longevity, and variety. It need hardly be repeated that the Indian System has endured through vicissitudes of political revolutions and is a living organization to-day, though disturbed on account of the influences of a materialistic system of education. The Vedanta Philosophy as well as the Sanskrit Language have been, we are glad to note, greatly appreciated both in Europe and America but the Indian Social System, I am afraid, is not properly appreciated abroad, though it can make, perhaps, the greatest contribution to the solution of the world problems of the age. The reasons are not far to seek. The Indian Social System is a complex system complete in itself and inter-dependent in its parts, evolving continuously under the impacts of history. It is hence difficult of comprehension in its entirety to the foreigner—nay even to many talented Indians who have been bred up only on Western culture. But the love and tenacity with which the Aryan Hindus cherish it even to-day in the length and breadth of the land and the happiness as well contentment it was able to carry to countless generations of the human family should suggest to us the value of unbiased research and inquiry at the hands of the learned savants of the world having the good of the human race and the love of the truth at heart.

In speaking of the Indian Social System I am referring to the system which is peculiarly Indian, existing in India from very remote times. It is the Aryan system as expounded in the sacred books of the Hindus and as lived in the corporate life of the Hindus from times immemorial. The Indian Social System like so many other systems of ancient times is essentially a socio-religious or religio-social system. Its principles and practices are based and ultimately judged by religious canons. Having been

based on the sacred-books of the Hindus viz. the Vedas, the Smritis, the Puranas, etc. the fundamental spirit of the system has remained practically the same though the interpretations have been here and there qualified, modified or accentuated through long vistas of ages by the incidents of local environment or the forces of personal equation. In this sense we may say it has evolved and reached the present stage. That its pristine lustre was far greater than the present we need hardly emphasize.

The Hindu or the Aryan Social System extends from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin over an area of **Expanse** about fifteen hundred and seventy thousand **of the** square miles amidst a population of about **System** twenty two crores (i. e 220 millions) Its roots are lost to human memory except through the Vedas; it was systematized by Manu who is regarded as the first prince and progenitor of the human race, as well as an incarnation of Vishnu—the All-pervading God. It was in full vitality in the time of the Mahabharata war about five thousand years ago. The Aryans according to the accepted orthodox theory were the original natives of India, the Gangetic valleys being some of their first lands of nativity. The system seems to have advanced towards greater and greater rigidity with the progress of time and the growth of confidence in its value. Rigidity was greatly due to its success. It is the price of longevity.

In order to understand the Indian Social System we have to realize its philosophical back-ground or the **Its Philoso-** philosophy of life which furnishes it its *rationale* **phical Basis** and gives it its *raison d'être* and its colour.

The philosophy is complex enough though not so complex as the system superimposed upon it. It is both analytic and synthetic, deductive as well as inductive. It may be said to be

spiritual monism. I see the world around me. It is changing, evanescent. Nothing that changes like a phantasmagoria can be really true. The worldly existence therefore is visionary—a dream. “We are such stuff as dreams are made of” as Shakespeare has said. The soul—the seer—is eternal. All things exist to him and through him. The realization of the truth of this spiritual unity and the unreality of this worldly existence is the way to happiness and peace. Entanglement in the magic of the phantasmagoria brings burdens and miseries. This entanglement is however natural on account of the psychic composition of the average man; and gradual disentanglement is the path to progress. Self-control and abstinence is therefore the key to salvation, all morality being even interpretable as *graduated abstinence*. All worldly truths are but tentative and relative. Absolute truth can be known only by the Omniscient and by us through Him only. All great problems being ultimately related to fundamentals, Revelation from God is the only *final* test of the validity of our beliefs. The Vedas are such supreme test, and they exhibit the principles of righteous action, proper devotion and absolute knowledge. The law of Karma (action) is “as you sow so you shall reap” either in this very life or in the life hereafter. The law is, ordinarily speaking, inexorable as any of other great laws but equally amenable to the considerations of circumstance, motive, antecedents and grace. The four basic principles of righteousness are (1) Non-hurt (2) Truthfulness (3) Austerity and (4) Purity;—the first two being the foundations mainly of the social, the latter two of the personal code—all the four tending to make man a better citizen of the world as well as a better pilgrim unto Salvation. Like other objects of Nature men also are *unequal* in their body, mind, talents, virtues, abilities and activities. To recognize this inequality, to understand it and to prescribe in accordance with it, is the right way of peace, justice and progress. The difference mainly arises from original

causes such as heredity, the primary momentum, nurture, environment and other factors. The social system therefore must provide for a proper recognition and regulation of all these in order that the greatest good of the greatest number and of all may be achieved.

The old Indian polity as established by the sacred books and long lines of kings all over India in times past is a polity almost unique in itself. The **The Aryan Polity** King is the supreme executive head. He is "Rajan" the *shining one*. He is neither a law-maker nor a law-giver. He administers the laws of a complete organic state as visualized by Revelation—the Vedas and the Smritis. He administers the Laws of God and hence is regarded as His representative. The Maharana of Udaypur even to-day regards the Eklingi (God Shiva) as the sovereign of his state and himself merely an administrator on His behalf. Prince Vena is stated in the Puranas to have been dealt to death when he declared himself an atheist and interdicted religious rites and sacrifices. In governing the people by a pre-conceived model this polity resembles the present polities of Russia, Italy or Germany. There was no room for *laissez faire* policy either in morals or in legislation. The state was ordained for the better realization of the divinity in man. King was easily accessible to the people and was the supreme judge as well as the protector of the people. Education was not the function, much less the monopoly or the instrument of the State. It was the duty of the King not to force his own religion on the subjects but to see them properly abiding by their own. In fact the Puranas mainly deal with ages when any other religions had hardly materialized. But even so the duties of the four social orders were different and King Ramchandra is said to have punished a *shoodra*—one of the lowest caste, who was performing

penance not permitted to him by the sacred books. Austerity, penance, knowledge were considered to be sources of power and their practices were jealously guarded. Experience has made us alive in these days to the risks of knowledge and power misplaced.

The relation of Religion to the State leads us to cast a glance at the relation of Society to the State.

Relation of The State was the protector of Society not
Society to its maker. The social system having been
the State ordained by power and wisdom and knowledge higher than that of the King, this was but a natural corollary. *Dharma* to the Hindu, is much more than religion, it is an entire *system of life* under which he has voluntarily chosen to live. It is not merely his private concern with his creator. It is the *law of life* personal as well as social. It exalts self-control with self-sacrifice and extols poverty unto those ends.

The Indian Social System which is so tenacious and popular is based upon four Varnas or classes with their numerous combinations and permutations and ramifications. These Varnas are further given a further chart for leading their lives in four stages called Ashramas. These Varnas and Ashramas are the keystone of the Hindu Social edifice. They were based initially on natural qualities and activities and were carried on through heredity by maintenance of respective discipline and professions. The classes are well-known. They were the Brahmanas or spiritual workers, Kshatriyas or Military workers, Vaisyas or Industrial workers and Shoodras or Physical workers. The Ashramas were those of (1) Brahmachari or disciple (2) Grihastha or house-holder (3) Vani or forest-dwelling recluse and (4) Sanyasi or the man of complete renunciation. Sanyasi

is considered to be the highest ideal of *man* in the Hindu Society. The Varnas or classes are regarded as the limbs of an organic whole rather than as divisions struggling against each other. Each, in fact, required the co-operation of the others. Each took a pride in standing by his duty and thus contributing to the harmony, peace, happiness and progress of the whole. These four classes were to be kept so far as possible pure and integral by means of purity of descent, propriety of culture and positivity in profession.

These classes continued for centuries and practically exist even to-day. But they could not endure for long in an ideal condition. Strange and often undesirable mixtures owing to promiscuous connections and otherwise, grew up, and they in course of time multiplied into large groups and settled down to particular professions mainly on the hereditary principle. These formed themselves into distinct castes. Several castes are mentioned in the *Smritis* and the *Puranas* which throw also plenty of light on their early genesis. The original Sanskrit word for caste is peculiarly significant. It means etymologically "of the known", and was meant to be a social group intimate, compact and manageable, and the caste or *Jnate* has mostly remained so even to-day. Its numbers interdine, intermarry, and co-operate in a thousand ways. The castes were a natural corollary and consequence of the principles of hereditary homogeneity, cultural similarity and spiritual affinities, which were considered to be of primary importance in the Aryan Social System. The Brahmana was for instance divided into more intimate and manageable groups on considerations of this nature. The Gujarati, the Deccani, the Bengali, the Punjabi and the Madras Brahmana has special culture and social practices of his own which distinguish him as a cultural

representative with a special evolution of habits, temperament and genius all his own. Besides location or country of habitation there is another potent factor of cultural and moral level which made for the crystalizations of castes. Castes for instance which maintain or are at least supposed to maintain a higher standard of morals or purity are distinguished from those of the lower standard. The castes which permit widow-remarriage and divorce are on a lower plane than those who do not. The castes that allow smoking are considered lower than those that do not. These castes are different groups on the various rungs of the social ladder. Each has usually its own distinct customs, traditions, managing heads and even tutelary deities. This is the present evolved condition of the original classes.

On a more detailed examination we find that the Caste-system is a beautiful, advantageous, homogeneous and highly scientific system. It has developed traits and abilities to such an extent that literature, medicine, trade, and physical strength have been specialties of special different castes and others can hardly outdo them in their fields. Castes, in fact work out the cultural assets by the aid of heredity and environment. They reduce jealousies and antipathies on account of their recognition of birth. They decrease uncertainties and catass trophies in trade and industries on account of the mandate of professions while they increase social sympathies as well as economic co-operation. They raise the social unit from the family to a much larger and homogeneous group. In fact each caste in India is a family on a larger scale. The castes are in their turn but component parts of the whole community which is a religious brotherhood united by spiritual ties, interests and affinities. They all realize a sense of solidarity and integrity which is further strengthened by pilgrimages which are a

great source of merit to the Hindu. These castes are proud of themselves, they carry on a healthy rivalry, they jealously guard against alien infusion or transfusion of blood and have sometimes their own organizations of education, charity and the like. It fact their vitality and potency are so great that complaints are often made that caste is a potent factor and consideration even in municipal and political elections. Thus in India the caste acts as a multiple social unit next only to the unit of the religious community in the matter of largeness, co-operation, and homogeneity.

The next smaller unit is the Joint Hindu Family. The Joint Hindu Family is at once the glory and the strength of Hindu Social life. It is a school of education, culture and self-discipline We find in the Joint Hindu Family, not only parents and children but brothers, cousins, nephews and even more distant relations living under one roof and sharing their meals, drinks, and delights together. The Joint Family is the home of the widow and the orphan. It is a training ground for the spirit of co-operation and accomodation. It is a fruitful source of economies and facilities. It does sometimes curtail personal liberties to an extent not agreeable in these days. We do not mean to suggest that either the caste or the family is an unmixed blessing beyond the possibility of misuse. There has been of late a tendency to minimize their advantages and exaggerate their drawbacks—a tendency towards disintegration and dismemberment in these valuable assets on account of the progress of individualism and libertinism. The joint family system however is so deep-rooted and advantageous that it is still a dominating factor of Indian social life. This system is highly prevalent in Maharastra and even in Gujarat, Bengal, Madras

and United Provinces large joint families are a rule rather than an exception, save in big towns. The graded income tax for higher rate on larger income has tended to disintegrate the Joint Family in opulent towns.

We have noted before, that the caste system is based upon a sort of rational gradation. The generalizations are based on close observation and inquiry the details of which can hardly be narrated in the small space of such an essay. It would be however interesting to give some telling and crucial illustrations. Purity of mind, purity of seed and purity of food are the three principle criterions. The highest caste in Gujarat viz. Nagar Brahmin has, for instance, very strict rules to observe. They have no polygamy (permissible in Hinduism especially for continuity of descent) no divorce, no widow-remarriage. They have to bathe before they can take their dinner and the touch of even an unclean piece of cloth necessitates a bath again. They cannot smoke. Drinking is an anathema. They are not more than a few thousands in the whole of India. But they carry the laurels now and again, especially in literature and political astuteness. To mention names would be invidious, but names of Sir Manubhai Mehta, Sir Prabhashanker Pattani and Sir Lallubhai Samaldas who have been leading political figures in Indian and State history deserve mention. The names of their men of letters are legion. Now taking the lowest rung of the ladder there are the Bhangis who serve the society by removing its filth and thus making for cleanliness. They do not grudge their profession for they were born to it, under a dispensation in which they have faith. They have easy divorce. They have developed physical constitutions to bear unscathed the contacts which to others would give death or disease. They are living a quiet easy life and it

is incumbant on every orthodox Hindu to give them gifts, food or clothing on ceremonial occasions and on great holidays. This however does not prevent the higher orthodox Hindu from preserving his own purity by forbidding to himself the contact of that caste. The Hindu of old realized that all impurity is traceable to or reduceable to the wrong contact and insulation is the way towards better purity. Then again the vegetarian is regarded as superior to the non-vegetarian. The Kunbi for instance is lower than the Bania because he can have divorce which the latter cannot, but he is superior to the Khawas who partakes of animal food. Even in Bengal the vegetarian Vaishnava is regarded with special respect. Drinking is forbidden to the Brahmana absolutely. And the Vaishya claims superiority over the Rajput, if the latter is non-vegetarian and takes alchoholic drink. The Kshatriya on the whole is given greater latitude in material enjoyments—both on account of his “soldier’s life” and the facilities and needs of his order. Hence princes have so often a large harem.

Incidentally we now come to the position and status of woman in the Indian Social System. The key-
The Position of Woman note of all social regulations regarding her in the Hindu System is preservation of her Purity. It is the *open sesame* of interpretation. Once we recognize the need and value of this objective, all else is easy to understand. Her dependence on the father, the husband or the son, her purdah or reserve, her so called legal and political disabilities can all be thus understood in their proper perspective. Woman is the husband’s left half which, by the by, contains the heart. She is the heart of man, delicate and and most cared for. She is his partner not only in material life but also in spiritual life and in daily religious rites such as Agnihotra. She is the heart and the power of the

Hindu Home. She was the inspiration of the Rajputs of old. She is exempt from capital punishment and to kill a woman is one the five most heinous kinds of sins. The *Sati* which really means "Chaste Woman" in heart, word and action, is the highest ideal of Aryan womanhood. The Sati of the warrior-class did usually prefer self-immolation on the funeral pyre of her husband in the ecstasy of her love. Like all self-sacrifices for an ideal including that of the soldier for his country or the scientist for science, it is held in great veneration, though in time the practice might have come to be abused. The Hindu widow of the higher classes (who cannot remarry) occupies a very strong position in the Hindu Family. She is to be delicately treated, other women of the family have to sacrifice their own particular luxuries for her sake and after growing older she is the venerable matron of the home. She has indeed in turn to lead a wholly celibate life, departure from which makes her lose all her privileges. Even the propensity or desire to remarry is considered a lowering moral weakness and an unfitness for the noble caste to which she belongs. The Hindu woman moves freely in her own circles, she attends temples, goes on social and ceremonial visits and is, so to say "master of formalities." She is enjoined to and she does avoid all inducements to contacts leading unto looser standards of morality. Seeta and Savitri are her ideals and she cherishes them to-day smiling under her lips at the complaints of those who as in Russia propose to alter moral values

I am conscious of the fact that I have touched but a fringe of the great subject of this essay. But

Conclusion I hope, I have tried to show the brighter side of this great social system with the principles of its interpretation. I do not suggest that it has no weaknesses or that there are no misuses. Unfortunately there are no unmixed

blessings in this world, and the best things have been so often misused. But it is ours not to pick holes but to pick up the gems. The Indian Social System is not only a beautiful organic whole but it has stood the test of centuries and is a living system even to-day. Surely it deserves the homage of our study and I am sure that the study shall be amply repaid in the happiness, enlightenment and progress of Man which we all have at heart.

Some Character - Stories

The average European is apt to fancy that the castes in India are so many divisions or distinctions without a difference. He hardly knows that almost each prominent caste in India has developed its own characteristic traits. Thus for instance the Rajput is impetuous, the Bania is cunning, the Brahmin is after-witted and the Kunbi is clownish. There are several well-known stories told about them, some of which are re-produced in old popular story-books. A few of them about Banias are so interesting as would bear summary.

This first one is the most well-known. A Pathan happened to stay opposite a Bania's house. The latter was in the habit of curling his moustaches after cleaning his teeth in the morning. This gesture, once observed by the Mahomedan, was construed as a personal affront against himself. "What do you mean" he vociferated "by twisting your moustaches against me? Who are you to insult me like that?" The Bania was a shrewd fellow and thought of teaching the fellow a lesson, by means of a ruse. He assumed airs and replied bravely that the Pathan was not the sovereign lord of the country to dictate to him what he should do. the Pathan in a mood of anger said that he would get up a number of men and have the Bania's house pillaged if he dared to be so insulting. The Bania retorted by challenging him to do his worst. The Pathan now began collecting and keeping men, in right earnest, in his service, and the Bania kept on

coolly gossiping every evening about having engaged and called fresh batches of men from this, that and the other place. The Pathan in trying to keep abreast of the fictitious numbers of the Bania, practically spent up all his hoardings and had even to mortgage his house. After he had exhausted all his resources and patience he blustered out to the Bania challenging him to twist his moustaches against him if he dared. The Bania with an internal satisfaction at the results achieved said "Beg your pardon, Pathan Sahab; after all, we are Banias and you are Ameers. Who are we before you to twist our moustaches?" "Turn it down then" vociferated the Pathan. "Why, seven times, if you please" said the Bania closing the chapter.

There is another story of a Bania who outwitted his creditors. A Bania found himself in debts which he could not possibly pay. The creditors heckled him and troubled him day and night. At last he sought the advice of a lawyer-friend, also a creditor, for finding a way out of the difficulty, promising at the same time, to pay off his dues in full. The friend expressed his doubts about the Bania's words but on being re-assured, advised the Bania to mimic the catery whenever a creditor came to ask for money and to give no other reply. Needless to say the trick succeeded well enough and the Bania was set down as having lost his wits. After a time the old friend came to ask for his money and pert came the reply, "Mew". "To me even?" expostulated the friend. But the friend only got a double "Mew" in reply.

Another story illustrates how a Bania "changed his turban". The Collector Sahab's horse happened to have strayed. The Jamadar who went for the search happened to ask a Bania who replied that he had seen one stray horse going the opposite way some time before. The Jamadar took the Bania at his word and, like a Jamadar, ordered him to go with him to direct the

way the animal had gone. The Bania was embarrassed at this new bother gathering. A fellow-Bania saw through the situation and said "Fellow, wrap your turban the other way". The Bania took the hint and said "Yes, Jamadar Saheb, but had not the horse big horns?" "What a fellow you are? Had a horse ever any horns?" said the Jamadar. "But Sir" said the Bania "The horse I saw had two." The Jamadar of course soon gave him up as a crazy fellow who did not know which is which.

There is a story of how a Bania managed to outwit a stranger. A traveller happened to go at a Bania's shop for some food-stuffs and asked for cheaper rates. The Bania agreed, hoping to manage by false weights. The stranger was accustomed to judge by sight how much the things should look and suspected foul play. He got the things weighed again but there seemed nothing wrong with the balance. Hence he challenged the Bania saying that his weights were false and he would take them to the authorities. The Bania remonstrated and the stranger's suspicion increased and he began to move for reporting to the authorities. But the Bania who clasped him would not allow him to go and a crowd gathered. The traveller tried to be free but the Bania was not a man to let go the fellow easily. He put the Panchheri (5 lbs. weight) in a dhottar and began to belabour the stranger who ultimately fled in helplessness. His complaint to the Magistrate was of no avail because no witnesses could be got, as it had appeared all the while that the Bania was merely flourishing his dhottar on the stranger's body, and the marks were dull on account of the thickness of the dhottar. This has come to be known as Bania's '*Bham Panchheri*' or Bania's doubtful deals.

Needless to say that these are old tales and the modern Bania is of course much reformed.

Religious Education

Man after all, is a creature of impressions and education is the greatest mechanism for giving impressions. Education has been spoken of as the attempt of men to train the future generations into the ideas and ideals in which they themselves believe. Lord Macaulay believed in a certain set of ideas and ideals and he set up an educational system which was intended to foster western tastes, ideas and methods of thought. The Germans wished to train up a nationalist and militant people and their education by the time of Bismarck, gave them a militant and nationalistic Germany. Russia—the Bolshevist Russia—is also playing the same game and aiming at the overthrow of religion altogether within a stipulated number of years by educational propaganda. Some countries that have not made up their mind either way are following a policy of drift in education. They move and change as the wind blows. But whatever may be the condition of human affairs the solidarity and happiness of a nation, of a people or a community will always be bound up with the character of its component parts. In spite of all talk of new morality and revaluation of values, the fact stands that the morals of individuals and nations are bound to have repercussion in fields of politics, economics, trade and foreign relations.

only way known to the ancients and to the moderns to build up character and to strengthen the morals is the way of religion. Another way is yet to be found.

We in India have been used to religious education from the ancient times. Our educational system **Education in India** was essentially, wholly and emphatically a religious system of education. It was religious in all its aspects in point of teachers, text-books, surroundings, methods and standards of discipline. In European countries also, the foundations of the Universities as well as of literature shall be found to be laid deep in religion, or religious impulse. Even to-day many of the countries in Europe have institutions, schools and colleges providing for religious education. Even the different denominations under Christianity are freely recognised for the purpose of education. ~~And~~ provision is made for them according to the circumstances or conveniences or the faith of the promoters. No doubt there is, in Europe a tendency gathering up its forces, which aims at eschewing religion altogether from education as from life. But the evil fruits of that tendency have been already perceptible in the present condition of Europe. Thinkers and observers have already begun to shudder at the thought of whereunto modern Europe is drifting. But that is not our principal concern just now. Suffice it for us to know that we have better guides to follow in the matter of education.

But the Governmental institutions have not yet deemed it proper to introduce religious education, not even to impart some religious instruction to the millions of boys and girls who are being trained to citizenship under their care. Thus a large part of the total number of educated young men and women comes out of the portals of schools and colleges without an adequate grounding in those fundamentals which are the ultimate goal of education as well as its basis. We have plenty of whetting of the intellect and plenty of non-moral ideas and information. Not that there are no high flights of moral virtue in the text-books of literature but the secular spirit behind the whole system reduces all of them either to the realm of exploded values or to platitudes to be used according to convenience. This is as it is bound to be; for, without the powerful impulse of religion, without the guiding light of faith, moral strength can hardly rise above the level of a general goodwill and lip-service to the great virtues which demand of us, self-restraint, self-sacrifice and self-discipline every moment. Morals and religion are not indetical but morals can be *well* founded in religion and religion alone. Religion is, as Carlyle says, the great fact about a man.

religious instruction. But it is regrettable that either on account of the want of sufficient demand for religious education on the part of Hindu witnesses or any other cause whatsoever the Committee have not laid the same stress for the religious instruction of the Hindus. Even where some efforts are being made for introducing religious instruction in the schools, colleges or universities the forces towards that end are being shunted from here to there and little achievement actually results.

The present position as regards religious education (or rather religious instruction) with regard to the policy

Policy of Government of the Government is that while provision is made for religious instruction in certain

Moslem schools conducted by the Government or the Municipalities, in the case of the Hindus, religious instruction is merely allowed *out of* school hours and the expenditure made therefore is not assessable for grant purposes. I am inclined to think that the whole policy of the Government as regards religious education is a mistaken policy. Firstly, there can be no force more conducive to law and order than religion and the greatest risk for a Government is to breed up the younger generation on a practically anti-religious and revolutionary system of education. Secondly, whatever may be the Government for the time being in a country, whether indigenous or foreign, ultimately the people are the State, and hence the *religions of the people are the religions of the State*. If we accept this position it comes as a natural corollary that the State should not be merely neutral as regards religions but it should respect duly all religions of the people and give sufficient educational facilities for religious instruction to their respective followers. Of course, this becomes the duty of the State when it assumes to itself the function of directly imparting education. Under such circumstances the State becomes the great

monopolist in education and if it does not impart unto its subjects the education which is fundamental to the formation of their character and to the preservation of their culture it would be abusing its monopoly or at least falling far short of the expectations which the monopoly is understood to involve. We have to press this point of view before the Government so that they may be more alive to the task before them,

The system of secular education is usually understood to mean a system which does not undertake to inculcate any religion or religious dogmas through its courses. But in practice it is much worse than what the attitude connotes. It has come to be positively a teaching against religious dogmas and practices and induces in general an anti-religious bias. Religious ideas and practices go out of the field, and the field is occupied by another set of ideas which are well-established neither in reason nor in religion nor in human experience. The exploded fads and shibboleths of old European revolutions hold the ground in our present system of education. When Democracy is being discredited and dismantled in Europe our university alumni talk as if it were the only salvation for India. The fad of equality is preached like an axiomatic truth while all facts gather to show that inequality and variety are everywhere conspicuous in Nature, and the Universe is a grand hierarchy of souls. While the Western Civilization is melting into the crucible before the devastating fires of Communism and Bolshevism we are asked to seek from it our inspiration and guidance. These are some of the principal tendencies which are behind our present educational system and which are responsible for the denationalization of our people and the degeneration of our ideals as well as the paralysis of our self-reverence which have followed in their wake.

From whatever point of view we consider, - whether from the point of view of building up character,

Conclusion or that of the preservation of culture or that of national solidarity and strength, I believe we must come to the conclusion that religious education is of paramount importance to the people of India. We have committed a great blunder in having failed till now to make sufficiently powerful efforts for religious education in the numerous educational institutions in India and it is worthy of the best efforts of the best amongst us that the Soul of India should again be rejuvenated by that spiritual culture which has been her heritage and privilege from times immemorial. It is for us to find the ways and means for this great and noble consummation and to make India again the land of faith and freedom, piety and religion, power and prosperity nobility and culture.



Indian Political Ideals

There have been, of late, many efforts at rapprochement between the various parties in the country and enunciations of the views and positions of the different parties regarding the New Constitution. While granting that the balance of parties might change with the force of personalities, we may say that these parties may be analysed into a few prevailing schools or sets of opinion, and it would be quite interesting to understand their quality and measure their value.

The most prominent amongst these political schools is nationalism. Nationalism is an ideal which starts with the *nation* as its central conception. It refers therefore to the political unit circumscribed and settled by geographical location. It is thus a physical and non-moral ideal. Its first concern therefore under conditions as of India to-day, is Liberty from foreign control. When the country is already non-dependent as Russia, Turkey, Italy or Germany were before the revolutions, its tendency is to levelize all extra-national considerations and submit them to the system visualized by the prevailing party. It might result in communism or national socialism or a militant corporate state or anything else religious, non-religious or anti-religious where circumstances lead it. India is in the first set of conditions. Therefore the outstanding political parties are more alive to the first concern, which is the more apparent,

the more widely felt and the more appealing concern. The central and the final power is foreign and the party that gives the most effective open resistance to it gets more general support and sympathy under the national ideal and secures the biggest voting.

Internationalism divested of any clear-cut moral or spiritual doctrine is as much a materialistic ideal—though a wider one—as the national. Communism is as much a communal ideal as that of any other community basing itself on an organic body of doctrine or opinion. If certain Communities, are based on a religious set of doctrines Communism is based on avowedly anti-religious set of doctrines. Both make an organic unity of doctrine their basis and both are international in their scope. What mainly distinguishes the one from the other is that while religious communities have a moral foundation in the usual sense of the term the communistic community is based on the economic materialism of Karl Marx. One accentuates the need of self-control while the other provides for self-indulgence. And hence while the avowed motive of both is altruism, in actual practice the methods and results are in line with their clues. In so far as India consists of religious communities and is religious at heart, communism is anti-national, if nationalism has a cultural connotation over and above independence. Those immersed in Communism try to override, overlook or suppress this issue. The religious communities in their pride and jealousies forget that their fights *inter se* are the biggest opportunities for anti-religious movements and are a manifest fall from their own ideals.

The National Congress has been sticking to the first inclination of a people under foreign rule. Thus it has secured more unanimity on that point while the religious wrangles divide the people on the cultural issues. The Congress gives

in to a cultural issue when it finds it tempting or potent, as in the case of the Khilafat or Communal Electorates for Moslems or so called Depressed classes. It turns its deaf ears when the cultural issue is inconvenient or not well backed up, as in the case of the Sarda act, Religious Education or the Temple-entry movement. The Congress cannot become culturally representative of the people because the religious communities are wrangling over excuses or non-fundamentals and cut the ground from under the feet of each other and its tendency therefore has been to levelize the communities to a dead level of utilitarian materialism, and to discount the homogeneous integral communal cultures.

The Moslems have seen through the game. They have by means of communal electorates sealed and secured their cultural integrity. H. H. the Aga Khan has in his recent statement, (since ratified by the Moslem Board) put in words which are as applicable to a move for all-communal rapprochement as they were for his community. "In a self-governing India the smallest and humblest should feel that his faith in religion will be secure and also his culture." The western education being less widespread amongst them and their position making for a stronger *esprit de corps* among the community, Moslems have been more easily united under a religious banner than the Hindus

The house of the Hindus is divided against itself by reformers like Mr. Gandhi, communists like Mr. Jawaharlal, religious indifferentists and liberals like Sir Chimanlal Setalwad and a few religiously inclined leaders like Pandit Malaviya or the Jagadguru Shankaracharya of Puri. The cultural protagonists look like back numbers in political circles to which cultural considerations count for a fig before those of resistance and rebellion, open or covert against foreign supremacy.

The position of the liberals or moderates is weakened by the dilution of the catchy Independence ideal on the one hand and by their accomodating parleys with the government on the other. With the abnormal weightage created in favour of extremism or radicalism by the political ideals furthered by westernization, with the creed of 'complete independence' permitted by the state and with the democratization of the constitution putting demagogic elements at a premium, these moderates have hardly stood high in the estimate of the politically-minded mass and stand no chance of beating the radicals at the ballot-box.

There is no party in the country standing for Swaraj, guaranteeing cultural integrity to all communities and proposing friendly relations with the British Commonwealth.



A Review of the Congress

The Indian National Congress was created to represent the people, it has come to represent a person. It began with a democratic pose it stopped with a virtual dictatorship. It started with espousing Indian aspirations, it ended with courting Western communism. Such a metamorphosis indeed deserves a survey.

The history of the Congress shows that its principal aim was, in the words of Sir Dinshah Wacha, "faithfully to echo the public opinion of all India." Instead of approaching the aim, the Congress has, by one step or another, ceased to represent so many of the Indian people. The Liberal Federation, the Moslem League, the Hindu Maha Sabha, the Labour Unions, the Varnashram Sangh and the Anglo-Indians are some of the great bodies of independent opinion apart by themselves. As a body which theoretically and practically represents in excelsis, the all-India feeling of dissatisfaction at foreign domination, it has throughout commanded a partiality from the general public and has succeeded whenever it worked with that clue except when hampered by the Government. But as regards the expression of positive Indian opinion it has miserably failed. Neither its political philosophy, nor its political methods nor its general outlook of life are essentially Indian. They are characteristically western at the core.

This development is not a matter of surprise. The Congress was founded under the inspiration of the late Mr. A. O. Hume a European Liberal. Western methods were thought expedient and natural for combating a Western Government. The then-fundamental principles of the Congress began with a western angle of vision towards Those of India. The first of them was "The fusion into one national whole of all the different and discordant elements that constituted the populations of India." The differences referred to were, of course, religious or what are otherwise spoken of as communal. All these religions or 'creeds', as they were called in derision, were to the westerner merely pagan, one as good or as bad as the other—all fit to be levelled down into one 'National' whole. And there was to be a 'regeneration' (second principle), evidently through the throes of a revolution "of the nation thus evolved." According to the third fundamental principle there was to be *consolidation of union between England and India* for bettering the conditions unjust or injurious to the latter. This consolidation appears to have been badly hit of late.

The Congress began in 1885. It had to work, we are told, "amidst much misrepresentation, obloquy and even abuse." In 1907 "an extreme faction of delegates deliberately chose to raise a split in the united camp" at Surat. Now it was that a written creed had to be formulated and the *object* of the Congress was set down as the attainment of what is commonly known as Dominion Status to be achieved by *constitutional means*. In 1916 a reunited Congress, as it was called, met at Lucknow but the union was regarded as the most superficial. In 1920 the Congress passed under the domination of Mr. Gandhi. In 1927 it adopted 'Independence' as the goal of India. In 1929 at the Lahore sessions the Congress declared for *Poorna Swaraj*. Thereafter the struggle has been keen and terrible in which

non-cooperation, civil disobedience and the rest of it had their ups and downs. The *Guru* of the moves has now announced the push to be an error as the disciples have failed.

We will now consider the steps which have conduced to the decline of the Congress as representative of the public opinion of all India. It is, no doubt a vigorous political body but its very history shows that it has not much cared, latterly, to include all political opinion, for free expression and recognition into its fold. We have already referred to the split which drove the Moderates out of the Congress. The great step in the decline of the Congress was its insistence on its resolutions being mandatory. It meant that those who could not honestly believe in the particular mandate had to drop down from the body. The Congress thus came to be a strong party in its insistances but ceased to represent the whole public opinion. When a body has to find out a practical way for actual governance, it may be necessary to dispose of opinions by majority of votes but when a body has to exhibit and represent the views and opinions of a large country like India, the method proves wholly misleading. The method does not represent all opinions, it only eliminates so many. Hence such a body becomes least fitted to represent the people before an alien beurocracy. Here lies exactly the weak point of revolutions. Revolutionists flourish by their power of resistance to the current *regime*, while on their success they become more wayward and autocratic than the regime they displace. Where the former regime feared to tread the latter would rush and trample those who dared to differ. It was so in France, Russia and elsewhere.

This brings us to the other great step of the Congress towards disintegration viz. dabbling in religion. At the start it was a body that discountenanced religion for a political ideal.

Religion is the very life-breath of India with the Hindus as well as the Moslems, with the Sikhs as well as the others. All great movements and monarchs in India will be found to have respected and acknowledged religion. Asoka propagated religion, Akabar respected it, Queen Victoria recognized it. This discountenancing of religion in the Congress was not so much in the creed as in the spirit. Most of the Congressmen were reformers or would-be revolutionists in their outlook of life. In fact some of their inspirers like Bradlaugh were atheists or positively anti-religious. The first President was a Christian convert. In fact this supreme emphasis on the political ideal implied depreciation of the religious emphasis and had its repercussions on the whole outlook of the body. In the beginning it flourished under the cover. The first religious dabbling came in for inveigling the Moslems by acceptance of Khilaphat partizanship by the Congress. But it was to support religion and had a good time while it lasted. We need not enter into later history. The second dabbling was when Mr Gandhi's anti-untouchability fad was taken up by the Congress at Nagpur in the teeth of orthodox Hindu opposition, as also of Jagadguru Shankaracharya. It was an easy job to pass the resolutions in the Congress led by pseudo-Hindus and social reformers and the resolution once passed took the non-conformist Congressmen into its grip, with the Gandhian grit. We have an instance of that grit in the way with which Mr. Gandhi is assuming and reiterating with the deafness of a gramophone record that "All India and all Hindus have agreed to the Poona-pact." What it was we all know.

The next step in marring the representative character of the congress was taken at Lahore in 1929, when the cabinet system was introduced. Till now the leading men of all parties had a place in the Working Committee. But now the powerful

party within the congress was to rule all congress activities. It will be remembered how Mr. Satyamurti protested against the new innovations and the procedure and walked out with his colleagues from the All-India Committee. The Congress now became the representative not of all its leaders but of its majority party. Not only in theory but more so in practice on account of the power, patronage and leverage of the purse of the executive.

The fall naturally accelerated with the smoothening of the ground and the obstacles of other opinions being removed. The last step in the fall was taken by the acceptance of the socialist programme at Karachi. From being the organ of the majority party within it, the Congress now became the organ of a few who had the ear of the Dictator. Then came Non-cooperation and the Civil Disobedience named "Satyagraha," or "Insistance on Truth" in the vernaculars, with its train of War-Councils and Dictatorships, into the history of which we need not enter. Like exclusive and effective autocracies the Congress has gained in strength but lost in representativeness.

It is rather strange that this whole development of the Congress position is very often forgotten, and it is assumed in certain quarters that Mr. Gandhi could be the Sole Representative of the Congress and the Congress was the sole representative of the country. It is a matter of history how the Nehru Constitution was condemned by several political schools of thought and had to be respectfully shipped aside by the Congress itself.

The Congress in its political outlook and colour principally represents the westernized Hindu political radical reformers. It could never command the allegiance of the whole people because it was never really national. It never represented the

national ideals, the national view of life, politics and religion. It was a conundrum of western views applied to Indian conditions. It was anti-foreign in the desire for grasping power and absolutely foreign in its views about using that power. Its political outlook was subservient to lessons superimposed through British history and its economics was the economics of Adam Smith and Marshall. Even Mr. Gandhi's *Khaddar* came in as a leader's fad at which the Congressites, in the beginning, looked askance.

What the Congress is desired to do is what it was primarily intended to do—to echo the public opinion of all India—to be the Indian Peoples' Parliament, —to reflect their varied and complex opinions on the positive side. The Britishers have seen too much of the merely negative work to allow it under their patronage. For this purpose it is necessary that the driving out, discouraging and discrediting of those who do not go by its mere mandates must disappear, and so also the policy, as in the Poona-pact, of pandering to the freaks of an individual however great. Otherwise it shall have to be satisfied by being taken as but one prominent party in the country.



Indian Conservatism

The suggestion for a mobilization of the conservatives in the Indian political field is coming from many parts of the country. It has to be, however, pushed through very carefully as the initial advantage to the other sides is not small. It would seem that the easy-going part of the world wants to go free-thinking and free-acting and is ready to give a handle to the radicals. Conservatism stands the chance of being derided as reactionary and inconvenient in these times. The Britishers would seem inclined to discount the ordinary forms of Indian conservatism to suit their claims as civilizers of India.

On the other hand conservatism has also certain advantages. People have seen through the fact that the radicals and revolutionaries are leading them on to the Bolshie bog, and that they are anti-national in principles, beliefs, ideals and methods. The Government have seen that to hope for co-operation from them is to run after will-o'-the-wisp. The world's developing situation shows that the so called liberalism as a drive towards liberty in morals and beliefs, in writings and conduct, has led to make confusion worse confounded. It is a way into, not out of, the bog.

What then is conservatism? Conservatism may be roughly defined as the *urge for conserving the best heritage of the past*. It implies a belief in the value, wisdom and light of the past,

and talents in the present to appreciate the past. Liberalism running riot turns into libertinism which decries against all checks over freedom and cries for a new order on the ruins of the old. Conservatism believes in the old order with its basic factors in religion, kingship and family. It believes in the established moral values. It believes in the institution of property as well as renunciation. It believes in fundamental spiritual guidance rather than in human dictatorship and in freedom from morals. The repercussions of the spirit of libertinism in the realms of life and ethics are too well-known to need reiteration.

Indian Conservatism partakes of the broad principles and tendencies of conservatism in general. This age especially has brought the revolutionary forces of the world into prominence; and they bid fair to swallow several nations unless the conservative forces of the world wake up, unite and organize themselves betimes. The conservatives have relied upon the inherent worth of their heritage and fought amongst themselves over ways and methods. And this fight *inter se* became the revolutionary's best opportunity. They have therefore once to unite and point out that their very differences accentuate the value of their fundamentals. Indian Conservatism therefore has a higher mission to fulfil than to work up merely a political party. It has to reiterate, vindicate and reestablish the moral and spiritual values which stand a good chance of being wiped off under the natural sensuous urge, helped by a materialistic philosophy—making man all the more unhappy under the new conditions.

The conservatives are really not a party; they are practically the whole of India. The conservative move is quite in line with the *progressive movement of India to come to its own*. The early veterans like Dadabhai Naoroji lay stress on India's political rehabilitation, Mr. Gandhi added to it the rehabilitation of the

industrial ideal. The rehabilitation of India's cultural heritage comes naturally in due course. While foreigners condemned Indian religion, the first group scrupulously avoided dabbling in religion; the next talked of *Satya*, *Dharma* and *Ahimsa* and the latest can make religion again the real heaven of life to revive India's glory and to realize India's great mission amongst nations of the world. Our brother-Moslems point the direction in which unity and success lie. Communities are groups or brotherhoods founded on a religious basis and there is nothing inherently wrong in recognizing and accepting those groups. Communalities are those of the blood and the spirit and are therefore keener, purer and nobler than political ones. They point out the goal to which the groups shall move for unity, harmony and solidarity. It may be remembered that many so-called nationalists aim at wiping off the communities in the long run. They mean to substitute the territorial for spiritual loyalties.

What then can be the fundamental principles and aims of the Indian Conservatives?—especially of their political party? The party may on its positive side be broad enough to include conservatives of all creeds and communities while on its negative side it should avoid interference with and scrupulously respect Religion. For, to every conservative, religion is the highest object of veneration—perhaps it is the acid test of his conservatism. The fundamental article of its creed therefore may be:—

(1) Reverence for all religions as paths leading unto morality and godhead, and non-interference in religion

Several different aims can be mentioned but the following three I think would cover most of them:—

(a) Conservation of the religions, cultures and established rights of the people, and exposure of anti-religious, anti-cultural and anti-national movements.

- (b) Attainment of Swaraj for India, i. e. government of India for Indians by Indians on Indian lines and in accordance with Indian ideals.
- (c) Rehabilitation of the economic prosperity, educational ideals and cultural hegemony of India.

As regards these three aims much need hardly be said. The first is fundamental, the second is essential the third is necessary. I think that the party, if it is to be strong, shall have to stand on principles, without pretence to compromises or resort to camouflages. One cannot fight with gloves on. There are two great immediate issues on which it can fight the battle of the people: The Communal Award and Communism. It must aim at smashing both, the first as absolutely unjust and second as anti-moral, and against both as anti-national. In this connection it shall have to expose the Congress, which sacrificed the cause of the Hindus to placate the Moslems or to keep up a show of representing all India by giving any price to keep them. It is said that if Moslems are fighting as Moslems, Christians as Christians, Shikhs as Shikhs, why should not the Hindus claim their own as Hindus? Are they ashamed to take the field as Hindus? But this argument apart, the communal award is an injustice to the majority of the nation. If the Congress really represented the nation it would not have betrayed the majority in this way. Further, the Congress is gradually drifting towards communistic ideas which are subversive of almost all that India holds dear and for which it stands viz. God, religion, family, social system, property and inheritance. Having considered communistic ideas as admissible it becomes only a question of the shifting balance of power for putting them on the statute-book. It is even argued that it has indirectly acknowledged communistic bias by accepting avowed communists as its leaders.

it has been flirting with communism and is only saving its face by keeping up appearances of orthodoxy before the Government and the people. Whether this be true or no, communism has to be exposed as foreign dumping brought about by anti-national surreptitious propaganda. There can be no true nationalism without loyalty to the ideals, institutions and culture of the land.

Now as regards Swaraj. The Swaraj envisaged by the conservatives being neither a communist dictatorship nor an unsuitable foreign graft of democracy the new party can evolve a more national and rational ideal. Some time ago a political thinker had pointed out the essential difference between democracy and old forms of Government. Old forms worked on a pattern of ideals while democracy drifts to anything where the popular vote leads it. Having no fixed ideals democracy can easily miss its way and be waylaid. I agree that not only democracy has failed in Europe and that it will turn into Plutocracy in India, but I think that we shall have to lay this ghost to rest in order to escape the process of drifting towards cultural suicide. Democracy in principle ultimately means that the vote of the many shall overrule all considerations. It is thus based on an implied falsehood that the value of one vote is equal to the other and on the error that mere majority can judge better. If we want to escape the tyranny of secular dictatorship and the exploitation of the people by a so-called democracy we shall have to stick to the Indian ideal. I think we should insist on good Government and Government by Indians rather than emphasize democracy which would land us into the quagmire of an exploiting regime and mischievous legislation. Further, if democracy means Government according to the will of the people, it must be interpreted as according to their religions; because people by their profession of a religion tacitly avow their allegiance to the system which the religion represents. Our ideal is *Rama Rajya* - constitutional


benevolent monarchy or Dharma Rajya—religious state, words which were once canonized even in—though lately cannonaded out of—the Congress.

The Conservative, *ex hypothesi*, wanting to conserve the best in his religious past cannot but be for his own past political glory and independence. For to him Swaraj is not only his birthright but a pre-eminent necessity for the preservation of his precious heritage. But while he would strive for Self-Government he would not be, overtly or covertly, for rebellion or revolution which would ruin the cultural assets and the established moral order and thus defeat his own best ends. He can be a cooperator or a fighter, a seceder or a supporter on the merits of the issues involved. On the whole he has a constitutionalist's mentality but he believes in a system of principles rather than in a mere constitution which may be but a reflection of the doctrines of the men in power. Even when democratically inclined he would fight for a Swaraj which would reflect in power all the communities in fair proportion to their numerical strength. The real key to the Moslem attitude is that whatever the Hindus might do, Moslems wish to make sure of themselves by guaranteeing their communal solidarity. They would not be unamenable to proportionate advantages in secular fishes and loaves if the fundamental cultural guarantees are assured to them, as well as to all other communities. The new proposal of welding or boiling all communities into a stew—this unity of cat, rat and rabbit into one cooked dish (—shall we say Chinese or Russian?) frightens them also. The emphasis of the conservative is more on cultural principles than on political bundling incidental to shifting boundaries of states. His goal is cultural though his means may be political. For, the state is after all for the consummation of a moral idea. Preservation of all just rights—of the all from peasant to the prince

will give him the best claim to the vote of the nation. The strikes and stifling cells, the tremendous national debts and taxes, the cleavage of the rich and the poor and tyranny over the subject or the service-giver are the gifts of the modern world since it proposed to manage without God, and made overlords of the cupid and the dollar.

I should not think it necessary to introduce the much abused word 'National' in the name of the new party. That an institution is national should rather be shown by facts. And now, when an alien Bolshevism is covertly being preached, I think it would be better to emphasize our stand-point as 'Indian'. Indian Conservatives or Indian Conservative Swarajists would be a fair title for the party admitting persons of all communities, standing by them without frown or favour, and working for established rights and religious solidarity of the people. India's cultural heritage should be its main keynote. Those whose loyalties are divided on the material side towards India and the intellectual side towards Russia shall appreciate it only when they come to realize that Indian intellectual and spiritual heritage is greater than the light from Mill or Marx. Till then even if our 'Ironsides' be a chosen few, we shall have to wait and work. Remnants save the nation.

Whether this new patriotic national grouping should forthwith take upon itself the setting up of candidates for election or should influence by propaganda and vote is a matter of tactics and local conditions. But it need hardly be said that if a powerful central group be once formed it can inspire and move on all fronts, through political, literary, educational, social and industrial conferences—all informed by its central principles.



The Devotional Poets of Gujarat

The whole atmosphere of old Gujarati literature is saturated with piety and devotion. The number of devotional poets in Gujarati literature is legion. But amongst them all three shine brightest in the realms of Devotion: Narsinh Maheta, Miranbai and Dayaram. All of them were devout Vaishnavas. All of them were inspired with enthusiasm almost unique. All of them had the gift of language adapted to the highest ends of literature. It seems they had realized the truth of the famous message of Narada in the Bhagawata :—

इदं हि पुंसस्तपसः श्रुतस्य वा स्विष्टस्य सूक्तस्य च बुद्धिदत्तयोः ।

अविच्युतोऽर्थो कविभिर्निरूपितो यदुत्तमश्लोकगुणालुवर्णनम् ॥

For, their literary work is nothing if not devotional. Miranbai represents the female heart, Narsinh Maheta the manly soul and Dayaram represents the man-poet approaching Lord Shri Krishna in the attitude of the Gopi.

Dr. Theodore Watts Dunton points out the existence of higher lyric poetry in the Hebrew language as worthy to be ranked with epic poetry. He calls it the 'Great Lyric' which he thus describes :—

“The Great Lyric must be religious—it must be an out-pouring of the soul not towards man but towards God like that of the God-intoxicated prophets and psalmists of Scripture.”*

*(Art. on Poetry in the Encyclopædia Britannica 11th Edition).

We see this description thoroughly justified about the poetic streams of these three great poets. Narsinh Maheta stands supreme amongst them all in the width of his vision, Miranbai in the depth of her emotion and Dayaram in the largeness of his human sympathies.

It is hardly possible to find out the exact dates of these early writers. Nor are those dry details our principal concern. Narsinh Maheta (about A. D. 1414 to 1481) and Miranbai (about A. D. 1403 to 1470) were almost contemporaries. But while the one breathed her first inspirations in the land of Rajput chivalry, the other a Nagar-Brahmin sprang up at Junagadh amidst the highest cultural environment. Dayaram (1767 to 1852) on the other hand rises up in Gujarat on the romantic banks of the Narmada. With Narsinh Maheta begins the greater poetry of Gujarat and so far as the unity of spirit and inspiration is concerned the *age of piety* in Gujarati literature ends with Dayaram. We have indeed to-day noble and exquisite outbursts of devotional songs from our new Gujarati poets and poetesses, but piety, religion and devotion are no more the prevailing features of the age.

The poetic creations of Miranbai are but few, those of Narsinh Maheta are exuberant and those of Dayaram almost promiscuous. The dominant characteristics of Narsinh Maheta's style are lucidity and culture; those of Miranbai delicacy and force, those of Dayaram sweetness and grace. The atmosphere created by Miranbai's poetry is of love superhuman. She carries the reader with her in her flights unto the Infinite. She moves in the aeroplane in the high heavens from which she scarcely looks down upon 'sour' humanity. 'She and her Lord' that is the all and all of her poetic plane. Narsinh Maheta goes to Vaikuntha, witnesses the *Rasleela* of the Lord and returns to our humble world to sing His glories. That biographical tale

about him is symbolical of his general attitude and literary pose. Dayaram lives on earth and is like, John Bunyan praying unto the lord for 'Grace Abounding.' It seems some ill-star pursued Dayaram from the beginning to the end of his life which on account of its externalities is often misunderstood. It was not his good-fortune like Cæsar's wife to be above suspicion. Miranbai, on the other hand, though her life is clouded with a host of varying traditions, presents a picture of a woman higher than a woman. She represents an ideal which though not appealing much to the worldly-wise, is and shall remain a noble and a great ideal. The glory of her name is shared both by the Hindi and the Gujarati literatures and like her Lord Shri Krishna she also made Dwarka her second home.

Narsinh Maheta's life on the other hand is wrapped up in a crowd of miracles each one of which is a household tale to the children of Gujarat. He is the saint, the hero, the devotee, the lyric poet of Gujarat *par excellence*. Piemanand is the only poet that may be thought to compete with him. But Piemanand's genius is mainly narrative, where indeed he is supreme. And he too is a singer of the tales of the Puranas conveying unto men the self-same spirit of piety, virtue and devotion.

Through such devotional poets as Narsinh Maheta, Miranbai and Dayaram we feel the light and love of Heaven radiating on Earth.



The Significance of Khaddar

Khaddar is not merely an article of cloth, it is the symbol of a faith. It was several years ago that this new symbolism was started and it has penetrated deep into the national mind to-day. All the implications of the khaddar were hardly understood in the beginning and are hardly appreciated even now, and yet the movement is growing strong from day to day.

As in all faiths there are in the 'cult of khaddar' the worshippers of the spirit and the idolaters of the article. It will ever be so in all faiths. Then again there are those who adore the soul and those who are enamoured of the form and colour. Some value it as a means, some as an idea, some as an ideal. Its value lies in all these but most, I think in the idea, Plato spoke of the 'ideas' of things which are perfect and eternal. It is such an idea of khaddar that is carrying all before it like a whirlwind.

Khaddar means strength, solidity, economy, it means less of mechanism and machines; it means independence, freedom, personality; it means a protest against philosophy of luxuries and the sophistry of industrialism, it means the reassertion of the principle of simplicity in things of the body and the saving of human energy for the nobler and higher aspirations of the soul. It is these implications or suggestions

behind the idea of khaddar that have made it a living gospel in India. It is the ancient civilization and the hereditary culture of India that have made her immediately and subtly responsive to the new gospel.

To say that khaddar is a political remedy against a foreign domination is to say but half the truth; **Value in Free Countries** may only a small part of the truth. To say that it is a remedy for industrial revival is also to see but one side of the shield. Khaddar can be a sane gospel even for a free nation, for it would release the energies of a country like Germany or United States from mechanical money-grabbing pursuits to those for the realization of the greater aspirations of the human heart. Even the great Russian, Leo Tolstoy, asked men, not long ago, to reduce the denominator of life rather than increase its numerator. If khaddar did not express the message sufficiently, Gandhi, its great Indian preacher has written down the great message in the hieroglyphics of his dress and living

Khaddar does not compete with the new industries, it rises above them. It is not a method of industrialism, it is an antidote to it. Incidentally **An Antidote** khaddar has been a fashion but really it is a protest against fashions. It connotes an ideal of simplicity of life and it cannot thrive where that ideal does not count. Khaddar means plain living and is perhaps a preliminary condition to high thinking. The businessman wants a motor car and he does not mind much as to the ways how he can get it. A luxurious England wants its annual millions for luxuries and it cannot see the injustice of keeping three hundred millions of people in political bondage. It was perhaps in consideration of the looseness of principles which the attainment of riches usually connotes that the Bible put the odds for a camel entering the

hole of a needle as higher than those for a man of riches for entering Heaven.

Then again, khaddar stands as a symbol of the method of supplying human needs; it stands for homecrafts; it suggests simple homely mechanism as distinguished from the gigantic mill machinery of modern days, which not only makes man dependent on machines but mars his individuality. The new industrial system tends to make a mechanic of man at the sacrifice of his personality,—the economic considerations of unequal distribution and needless over-production apart. Khaddar stands thus as a protest against that vision of life which a modern poet, Bottomly, derides, saying "Your vision is machines for making machines"

Some people tell us that the preaching of khaddar is not economically sound. The remark is correct as well as incorrect. All economic considerations and doctrines presuppose a certain basic ground of ideas. If we want luxuries, if we

Irrelevant Issues want strife and competition, if we want Capitalism with all its corresponding evils, if we are prepared to countenance that state of society which Tolstoy has exposed in one of his novels in the words "I am after his pocket and he is after mine", then indeed khaddar is economically unsound; but if we want contentment, simplicity, harmony, peace, life and light, the economics of khaddar cannot be beaten. Swadeshi is one thing, khaddar is another. Swadeshi connotes the considerations of one's country,—one's motherland. Khaddar connotes a wider and a greater ideal which is related to the fundamental aspirations of the human heart for a life more in consonance with nature and with man's higher destiny.



To the Indian Youth

*I deem it a privilege to meet you, young men, in this conference because if on the one hand we are eager to bequeath to you the great heritage of India in its pristine and perfect glory because in you is our hope and our strength, on the other hand we feel a thrill of joy when we find that the youth of India is also desirous to receive and cherish that great heritage, for fulfilling the noble and unique mission of India amongst the nations of the world. We are told that the youth of the country is being weaned away from Indian ideals to run towards Russia, but I have faith that the Indian youth will not be carried away from the ideals of its motherland and will in spite of all alien efforts remain Indian and stoutly Indian at the core, with his self-discipline, self-reverence and spiritual fervour.

I do not think you need to be reminded of the greatness of India's past. But I am afraid that in practice we often discount the past and sometimes forget that the light, as Wordsworth said, is behind us. The conflicting 'isms' and downright dogmas of to-day lead us nowhere but into the abyss of darkness, discontent and despair; or unto anti-religious and godless dictatorship. I believe we Indians need not go to Russia

*An address written for the Annual Conference of The Yuvak Sabha at Shikarpur, Sind, on 18th Nov. 1835.

to learn the principles which will ever stand us in good stead. India has everything in its established culture to give us strength, glory and greatness. Turn to MaxMuller and you will find the value of its linguistic heritage Schopenhauer and Radhakrishnan will tell you of the greatness of its philosophic heritage Gandhi has shown in no uncertain terms the value of its economic principles Arvind Ghosh and Dr. Ravindranath Tagore have exhibited unto us in translucent colours the glories of spirituality and repose, which after all are not such bad things as they are often made out to be. In politics also you have the glorious traditions of Ramchandra and Yudhishthira in the ancient and Rana Pratap and Shivaji in recent times to give you inspiration and example You have the philosophy of the Vedanta to realize unity in diversity and the Varnashrama system of society to enable every individual to evolve his self through a social, moral and spiritual ladder. We have the highest ideals of womanhood in Seeta and Savitri, in Ahalyabai and Miranbai.

What is it, it may be asked, that has made some of us in these days to discount these ideals? No doubt the impact has been received from the western education of the peculiar Indian type which is not Christian but subtly pernicious towards Indian religious beliefs But there is another factor, a more or less a potent factor, which serves to discount all religious influences. Of the two great instincts in man the love of law and the love of liberty, the latter often proves the more powerful and leads him into pitfalls and dangers. But, look where you will, it is ultimately the law that prevails. Even for liberty and within liberty you have to seek the strength of law. Religion is the law of life given by or revealed from God and it is a privilege in life to have faith enough to guide one's actions and ideals by that heavenly pole-star. You gentlemen

are shrewd enough to have noted that even in these times the ultimate events have turned upon the pivot of character. There can be no reliable standard of integrity and honesty of character without an ideal envisaging the Divine and there can be no guarantee of its fixity unless it be embodied in books or works which have more than earthly authority. Religion, true religion is so great a force for character that no nation can afford to do without it for long. As all religions are practically highways or byways to one great goal it stands to reason that one may have his own source of light according to his faith. It is in following this Light—the light of Religion that I believe lies the Salvation of India. It is the kindly light to which it has once again to say:—

Lead, Kindly Light, Lead thou me on !

Having thus laid stress on religion as the great source of light, power and character for the individual as well as the nation, I pass on to the important subject of physical culture. I think I am not far wrong if I congratulate you, young men of Sind, for your stout and robust physique I tell you, gentlemen, it is a precious possession and in due justice to posterity it is your duty as well as privilege to preserve and develop it with necessary physical culture. In this connection I may mention to you the great value of Soorya Namaskaras as a very beautiful and noble form of exercise I would also insist upon you to play Indian games and to bring them into fashion. We Indians can hardly afford such costly games as Cricket which I for one would not like to exalt into a national game. Why can we not evolve our own games ? They are less costly, less risky, less distracting and more in consonance with our national life. Above all, gentlemen, develop the sportsman's spirit in you. Take even defeat without being ruffled, give even your opponent his due, and learn to play your part as best as you can in life.

If we develop this spirit, I think we would be far on the way to unity which we all have in view. In this connection I am reminded of the complaint raised against the *recognition of communities* which is wrongly dubbed as communalism. As there can be a wrong type of nationalism there can also be a wrong type of communalism. But there is nothing wrong in recognizing *de facto* groups based on particular religious faiths. They have asserted themselves in politics and in plays, in cricket and in constitution. We do not want a new social planning in which God and Religion are to be negated. The communities are facts, they are living institutions, they exhibit themselves in practical life and only those with their face towards communism can deride the existence of communities. India is a vast sub-continent and the existence of these communities as communities is not and can be no bar to its political progress. What we want is amity and good-will between the communities. And it can come only from due recognition of their existence and rights coupled with a spirit of sympathetic accomodation.

In this connection I may also point out that for amity and unity *inter se* within a community it is necessary that we should not fight amongst ourselves, even under pleas either of reform or progress. If Indian things that be, are unpalatable to any of us let them rest content by introducing a change for themselves but it is the way to disunion to try to force it by legislative coercion. The temple-entry bill was a measure of this kind which the Hindu opinion so strongly opposed and condemned. We can be more united only by a strict observance of the principle of non-interference in the religious practices and beliefs of the people—principles which were endorsed by Dadabhai Naoroji, Lokmanya Tilak and so many of our accredited political leaders.

We are often told these days that religion and therefore the communal outlook based thereon are a block in our national progress. I would emphatically say they are not. We are not for the selfish individualism of Europe or the materialistic socialism of Russia. We are for a synthesis of the underlying virtues of both in what may be called religious socialism. We want an Indian India if I may use the phrase, in politics, in economics, in social fabric, in moral and spiritual ideals. In Indianization alone we can find our unity and our strength. Develop the Indian outlook of life, I have to say in conclusion, believe in India and in Indian Faith. Work out your own political system and make your mother-land an Indian India again.



Indian Autonomy & Indian Culture

India is out for *Swaraj*. It is not likely to rest till it gets it. It is sure to get it, — probably, in the near future. The sooner it gets in the better for all concerned,—for Englishmen as well as Indians. What shall be its form? The form of *Swaraj* is a material point, but the substance of it is not less material. The form and substance together will make the constitution.

It is a noteworthy fact that the common people in India do not care about the details of a complex constitution. It is not the constitution that they want; they want their own constitution-makers. Any constitution that is built up in England, will remain self-condemned. Any which is built up on British ideas of constitutional proprieties will fail in actual working. Both the Simon Report and the Nehru Report have been discounted. The essential factor of the people's demand, one would think, has not been realized. It is not mere *status*. It is not democracy. It is not a parliamentary constitution. It is nothing less and nothing more than *Swaraj*, and till that is achieved, there will be no peace in India. Any government will eke out a tolerable existence but the troubles will continue. *Swaraj* means *own government*. India wants its own government; i. e. government by Indians, for Indians, in the spirit of Indian culture and in accordance with India's own institutions.

The trouble with British dispensations is that they serve and maintain British interests rather than Indian. The trouble with the dispensations of nationalist leaders is that they are mostly out of tune with the Indian spirit, traditions and culture. The secret of the paramount success of the great leader Mr. Gandhi, lies in the fact that he is not much enamoured of the Western culture and its institutions. He has expressed his want of faith in Parliamentary institutions. His method of fighting the government by bearing blows is distinctively Indian. His economic ideal embodied in *Khaddar* is Indian to the core. His attitude towards lawyers, doctors, and exploiters is in line with the Indian popular opinions. He has been talking about *Dharma* and God and *Rama Raya* all through. It is a notorious fact that many of the other prominent leaders are but indifferent lovers of God, religion, and Indian traditions. The Nehru report does not even guarantee non-interference of the state in matters religious; and the President of the last National Congress has acknowledged socialist leanings. Thus if on the one hand, the British proposals err by being interestedly British, the congress' or liberalites' proposals err by being anti-Indian from the cultural standpoint. If the Government wants to exploit India, the nationalists want to westernize it. Both the contingencies are undesirable to the large majority of the people of India as well as to the non-westernized representatives of its culture. The vocal opinion which can express itself in *effectively* good English, is naturally that of those who have been saturated with the modern Western culture. Onlookers are beguiled into the belief that theirs is the principal say to be taken into account. And hence arises the great error in apprehending Indian problems. The Britisher cannot know the Indian masses intimately. And the Indian with the western political outlook, does not care to give out those things with which he is at variance. And the blind man's buff goes on.

It is not a made-up constitution that India wants. The constitution for India 'must grow from within' and it must grow in sympathy with its conditions and environments. In fact, one might think it has not to grow at all. The big banyan tree of the political constitution is already there. There are the Indian States, various and numerous, which are long built up, and have been working in line with a great and noble political tradition. And some of them are keeping up tolerably, sometimes admirably, satisfactory conditions. The whole workable mechanism is there and it is working well. But they are not to be thought of; they are no models to our lovers of democracy,—a democracy, which as so many of us know, is still on its trial and has succeeded nowhere. We are told that in this bad world, there is no better way of governing. Even the Simon Report has a peculiar way of presenting that side of the question. "The introduction into an oriental country, with a long history of *autocracy*, of methods of self-government, evolved during centuries of experiments by western nations, for its own conditions and its own people, was a momentous and even hazardous enterprise". But the radical question that is to be asked is: Have the new institutions succeeded even there? Peace, prosperity and happiness are stale words but they shall ever remain the test of success of political institutions. And I think many of us have reasons to think that Europe is moving from the frying pan into the fire. It was but the other day that we were told of the present menace—the crash of empires, the agonies in the mental world and the shrivelling of morality under the new conditions.

In spite of all formal political talks, it may be understood that India will not be practically satisfied with modified dominion status. It wants Swaraj. The usual grounds for political autonomy are there. The economic grounds have

grown up apace, but the still greater grounds are cultural. India feels that Europe, in spite of its powerful weapons of war, has hopelessly muddled up its own social affairs, and the sooner India is relieved from its infectious contact, the better will it be for its happiness and peace. It feels that in advancing in line with Europe and to the goal to which it is advancing, its own spiritual, moral and social heritage will be undone. It feels the anomaly of a noble culture under the thumb of one merely more powerful. The talk of civilizing India by railways and telegraph does not appeal to it. To the traditional Indian mind the history of the British Rule in India has been a progressive movement in the wrong direction—from contentment to discontent, from peace to revolution, from moderate social happiness to the break-up of the social order. Laski points out that “modern politics is becoming an enquiry into dynamics of peace”, “Our ultimate allegiance is always to the ideal” and that “the state exists to enable men at least, potentially to realize the best that is in themselves.” We are further away from peace and from the ideal than we ever were. We are warned often times to avoid the confusion between the state and the society. And yet the state bids fair to encompass society in its bounds. People are being already enamoured of Russia. Who knows whether the severance of the bond of dependency will not benefit England all the more, when India will be freer and abler to fulfil her mission amongst the nations of the world ?

What Indians want and what they do not want may be thus summarised :—

- (1) They want Swaraj or their *own* government, which is to say that they do not want a foreign government.

(2) They want *good* government; they do not want to be exploited or over-taxed by any form of government, however tempting in name. They do not want to be confounded in an anti-religious democracy or dictatorship.

(3) They love their old laws – the Hindoos, the Mahomedans &c., their own respectively. They are satisfied with them. They have little charm for councils and assemblies legislating for them *ad infinitum*.

(4) They want their godly religious life to continue without the interference of civilizers who have learnt their lessons in Europe.

(5) They want cheap food and cheap necessities of life. They desire neither the temptations nor the burdens of luxuries.

This, broadly speaking seems to be the diagnosis of the present mentality of the great masses of the people. All human nature indeed is inflammable and prone to temptations, imitation and infection. The revolutionary influences have already begun to work in all directions, social, religious, moral and economic as well as political. Of course, we need not be afraid of revolutions. We are in an age of revolutions. But revolution by itself, cannot dupe any but mere enthusiasts. The great danger in India's present situation is that with the political revolution, its social, moral, and religious fabric will also be vitally affected, while there will hardly be the old safeguard of a non-interference policy on the part of the government. There will not be the back-ground of religious traditions of the British constitutional monarchy, nor the spiritual enthusiasm of the Puritan builders of the American States. The nobler and direct forces of religion shall be out of count, and their place may likely be taken by false communal pride, parading and fighting under ostensibly

national pleas. The great mischief of the western education in India has been that most of its foremost recipients, have got their faith in religion shattered. They would not accept Christianity as being a foreign graft and as being already in bad repute in Europe. They are out for a new nationalism, in which the great heritage of India's past may practically be drowned. Perhaps it will not be drowned, but the conflict may be great and tremendous.

What adds more to the difficulty of the Indian problem is that India is not merely a country but a continent. The implications of the fact are usually left out of count. It is a land of many religions and many languages. Every religion expresses an internally homogeneous and distinctively cultural unifying bond. Further, various groups of people have developed their own distinctive lines of action and modes of thought. The western education has created a new politically-minded intelligentsia, which is out of tune with the general people—except in so far as antipathy to an alien rule is concerned. It is a very suggestive index that the people can be easily persuaded against voting for the councils, against cooperating with a royal commission, against a Simon Report or against British goods, while they can hardly be persuaded to become members of the Congress. Thus there are varied and often conflicting interests, which may be played against one another and which often are earnestly at variance. The Britishers might in these circumstances find it a very convenient job to pull on convalescent existence, a little longer, but the general discontent and the feeling of hatred against the government increases, and the *divide et impera* becomes more a scandal than a success. Further, the politically-minded intelligentsia though small, is a substantially large body of men, and those amongst them who are converted to the western institutions

and who cling and insist upon them, are fewer still. But it is these latter few, who are experts in the western political game, they manage most of it, and they do it in such a way as to suit the general political attitudes of the people. But sometimes the cat is out of the bag. They sometimes presume to dictate beyond the general attitude, and then like the Nehru report, their proposals are thrown overboard.

All these considerations complicate the Indian problem. And the way out therefore depends not so much on the details of the constitution as upon the development of confidence. For it may happen that clever British statesmen might succeed in persuading certain sets of advanced Indian politicians and yet the people and even a large part of the politically-minded *intelligentsia* may not be satisfied; and the feeling for revolt and revolution may grow from more to more. The duty and responsibility of the British Government is of a very complex nature, whether they be considered as trustees or guardians or rulers for the time being. They have got to realize not only that India has been exploited enough, but also that it cannot now be profitably exploited. Of course, in political matters, one is expected to leave unspoken the moral and historical fact that the exploitation of an unwilling and shrieking India has not helped England a great deal.

The trouble with the modern attitude is, that we usually go in for the cure of symptoms rather than for a radical cure in political affairs. Or, it would be more correct to say that when we are out for a radical cure, our remedies usually bring in worse complications. In India, the government is out for curing the symptoms. In Russia, they went in for a radical cure, with remedies, which have made the case more acute and hopeless. "Russia" as Sir John F. Faser pointed out "is

reeling back to the dark ages. There is no more sorrowful tragic land in the world". The case of India differs from the three *great* revolutions of the world. The French Revolution was a protest against misrule. The American Revolution was an effort for home rule. The Russian Revolution was, as we are told, a revolt against despotic rule. The revolt of India is against foreign rule. Whether the revolt be regarded as justified or not, it can at least be easily understood. The teaching of European history and of the new political theories, in the Indian Universities could not have gone in vain. The *alumni* of the *Alma Maters* did what they were expected to do. They were fired up with a zeal for independence, for regaining which, they naturally thought of the western methods of agitation, resistance revolt and terrorism. Of these methods, the first three are well recognized in Europe and the fourth is not absolutely unusual. The British government about the middle of the nineteenth century made the cardinal error of introducing the western education in India. They boiled the cauldron from which the hymn of hate was to arise, and which created forces tending to overthrow the most glorious heritages and institutions of Indian civilization. True it is that even otherwise the upheaval in European thought, could not have left India untouched. But India had a philosophy, a religion and a culture which, if they had been the basis of its educational fabric, would have stood the test against the materialistic and self-aggrandizing tendencies of European civilization. It is rather strange that even after the failure of the present system of education in India, there is no idea of crying a halt for a radical change. Even the Simon Commission Report avoids, what it calls the "previous question" in Indian education. It says:—

"We do not deal with the "previous question" which has been frequently raised by European as well as by Indian

critics, whether public education in British India has not from the beginning been developed on wrong lines. Those who take this view, contend that western methods and objectives, have precluded the growth of an indigenous culture expressive of and responsive to the different types of native genius, and ask whether a re-orientation of the whole educational system is not required both in the figurative and the literal sense of the word. There is much that might be said on either side. But we are now concerned with the facts and tendencies as we find them in the period subsequent to the Reforms, in relation to the political and constitutional issues of responsible self-government.”

—(Vol. I. P. 402).

In spite of the limitations of the scope of their inquiry, we can hardly forget that education and especially higher education really means, a training of men in certain sets of ideals and ideas; and if these are initially mischievous, it would be idle to pine at the results.

Sir John Simon hit the mark, when he said in an interview that “the ultimate solution of India’s problems would not be a mere imitation of the western system of representative government. The educational minority wished for a rapid advance, but the only sort of advance they could visualize, was one wholly alien to the eastern mind.” Yet, what else could have been expected from those Indians who were bred up on the milk of Mill, Spencer, Rousseau, and Bentham? The results of marx are yet to be seen.

The question now is, what is the way out? And in this connection, one is inclined to think that there should be a double-sided work—educational as well as political. The educational policy should be vitally changed. Its basic outlook should be Eastern on all essential humanistic factors. The-

teaching of science proper may remain, but all study of western thoughts should come at a very late stage, only in specialized courses. English language should cease to be the principal language in the curricula, and the medium of instruction; and its place should be in the optional courses. The people will not be against such a change, which though radical will be immensely welcomed by them. The westernized educated minority will, perhaps turn round and oppose such a step, but the people shall soon know which is which. This step can be achieved without any trouble at all, and the results will be most beneficial to the Indian people. If the government can do this they shall have made ample amends for the initial error.

It is more difficult and perhaps more hazardous to say what would be the most desirable line of action in the political field. This much may easily be said that no constitution forged in England on western lines will be palatable to India. And in this connection it may be said that India's advocates might agree at a Round Table Conference held in England on a constitution which in practice would not suit Indian conditions and there shall ever be trouble ahead. If we think about the best thing to be done also on Indian lines, two or three ideas suggest themselves to us. Firstly, the head of the government in India should be an Indian, and a Prince of the royal blood, whether he be nominated, selected, or elected, Secondly, certain scale of tribute should be fixed up for being paid by India to England for the purpose of covering her obligations, and the interference of England in Indian affairs be reduced to a minimum. In other words, India should be in a relation with England analogous to the relation between an Indian State and the British Government. India has reached a stage when nothing more may be coveted from it by England without making sacrifices more costly than the profits. England may have to

solve her problems of unemployment in her own way. And perhaps she will do so better when she is a friend rather than the master of India. The third thing that suggests itself is with regard to the costliness of the Indian governmental machinery. Whatever may be our method of treatment of the other problems, at least so far as the salaries of the civil services are concerned the surgical method will be most welcome to the Indian popular mind. The maximum salaries to be paid to the officials should bear a certain reasonable ratio to the average income of an Indian. This step may be resented by the Services themselves but the precarious condition of the Indian political situation would give sufficient vindication of the step and would demand that much sacrifice on the part of the Services.

These are some of the main suggestions that can be made with some confidence of their being likely to be appreciated by the great masses of the Indian people whose welfare and good-will should be an important if not the main consideration with the British government and with the great leaders of political thought in India. The furtherance of democracy to this or that degree, is an irrelevant point. *Swaraj* is the fundamental idea. But the great and crucial problem of India to-day, is not whether it shall have Swaraj (because everybody has to agree to it) but *it is how there can be a safe transition to it*. It can come peaceably or violently, with *recognition* or with *revolution*. In a revolution the danger to India is not small. But its leaders are so heartily tired of British domination that they would not count costs. On the other hand, if liberty has to be attained, with such a violent disruption as would involve the break-up of the social and moral order, and the disintegration or collapse of Indian civilization, the catastrophe would be the greatest that has ever occurred in modern history; and the

responsibility of it shall be also on those who claimed trusteeship of India. India's freedom is a great thing, but its civilization and culture are things still greater in terms of human values.

I may repeat in conclusion what I have said elsewhere. "The ideal of political Government living in the hearts of the people is far removed from the impasse in which the British rulers have brought about the Indian affairs. It is the ideal of a theo-aristo-democratic state in which the laws are based on the Revealed World, the supreme Pontiff is a hereditary monarch specifically trained for beneficent rule, and the aristocracy of virtue and self-sacrifice functions for the state in the interests of the whole Demos."



Oriental Learning


Oriental Learning deserves to find a securer place than it has hitherto received in our Universities, which would be justified in deciding to make provision for the *proper* study of the cultures of the peoples of their own territory. It is natural that even in the sphere of education, India must come to its own after being spoon-fed for so many years with western culture. It is not a matter of rounding off the University activities but of turning them into a new channel altogether. Westernization of education has gone on apace to the disadvantage both of the rulers and the ruled and circumstances have gathered to make people cry for a halt. There are signs of the fast-growing public desire for the Indianization of education.

Oriental literature is studied at present in the Bombay University but it is studied from the western standpoint with the western background and under the covert but clear assumption of its inferiority. The destructive criticism has been rampant and the secular view predominates, to the great detriment of the students' faith and sympathies. There are some who believe that the present western culture is the only useful business of the University but there is nothing in the old University Act to show that the University was made for western culture alone.

Two fallacies usually creep into the consideration of the delicate question of cultures, and are behind the attitudes usually accepted. Some of the University "Intelligentia" seem to think that westernization of India is the only way to political salvation. I do not think so. Westernization would be too high a price for the political job and is neither necessary nor expedient. Our Anglo-Indian friends on the other hand regard anything against western culture as a reflection on the British rule. But to be plain, the spirit of modern western culture really runs counter to the innate conservatism of the British people and the noble Christian ideals which inform the earlier European culture.

If the Shastries and Moulvies are of less value to-day it is because of the western angle of vision which has overawed our society. These beautiful flowers and fruits of oriental culture *need no baking nor half-baking* but for those in whose hands they have fallen. The situation rather demands an early remedy. If the convenience of new courses creates a rush it is rather a consummation devoutly to be wished for. But we need not be disappointed if there is no such rush; for, the value of such a move is not to be measured in £ s & d. or by the dry standard of utility but by its influence on individual and social life. There has been of late a revival of interest in ancient cultures, and we require intelligent Pundits who can supply the religious culture which the people want and are ready to pay for. The need is all the more accentuated on account of the disintegrating and protestant tendencies of the present education.

The present faculties in the University are practically faculties of western learning. The new faculty should function for the study of oriental learning, in the spirit of the orient and in the interest of oriental culture. Much, of course, shall depend on how the idea is worked out. The fact is that at present our university provides mainly for western learning and incidentally for oriental learning on western methods and in western light. In the proposed faculty, I think the process may have to be reversed. It shall provide for eastern learning and incidentally for western learning in the light of eastern culture. The British Government which is the inspirer of our educational system has nothing to fear from the new move. The Shastric type of culture has lent and will lend its weight, invariably and definitely to the forces of virtue, order and conservation. It needs no argumentation to show that forces of rebellion and iconoclasm are being recruited mainly from the products of western culture.



The Government and Terrorism

The Government in India desires to stamp out terrorism but its policy has tended to consistently breed the spirit of revolt in the length and breadth of the land. The spirit of revolt is the chief driving force, terrorism is a mere matter of temperamental reaction. Perhaps the Government are not unaware of the facts relating thereto though they seem to be hardly alive to the cause and effect relationships.

A preliminary word is necessary by way of stating two fundamental facts about the Government. Firstly it is a foreign Government. Hence it follows that it hardly knows the mind of the people; it has to rely upon a few *confidentes* and to seek its clues from the newspapers and the dinner-tables. Secondly it has assumed the pose of civilizing the country. This pose is perhaps thought to be the moral *raison d'etre* for the Britishers to be in India. By consequence they have to assume that the Western culture is superior to the Indian. Germany might admire, and seek inspiration from, India, but it is considered impolitic for the Britisher to grant India's moral superiority. This is the key to the Miss-Mayo-mentality and Superiority-Complex of trusteeship. These two things—Alienity and Vanity, *one a disability and the other a pose*, are mainly responsible for the series of political blunders which have resulted in terrorism and much mischief besides.

Now to the items of blunder of policy. The first mistake has been that of foisting or imposing western culture on India through education. Macaulay introduced the mischief in spite of warnings. He perhaps counted upon his people making money while the Indians would learn to ask for their rights. He was also obsessed by a vaingloriousness for European culture, and did not realize whereunto it was leading. Even men like Bacon have fallen into the error of initiating wrong diets and of creating like Frankenstein, hobgoblins which bid fair to devour them. No sane thinker can now misunderstand the tendencies of modern European Civilization (which began with the spirit of protest, dissent and revolt) and its literature which is its exponent and driving force. Communism is not a menace to that civilization, it is its ripening fruit. Between the spirit of rebelliousness and terrorism, as between communism and bolshevism there is but a step, — a mere matter of circumstantial expediency and personal predilection. If one is led into the secular mood of regarding God a problematic entity, religion a bundle of superstitions or impostures, and moral values a matter of changing convention, what moral reason is there for one not to remove an inconvenient person or power out of the way with either an elbow or a revolver or a bomb? After the moral disability to commit the crime is removed by devaluation of values, the motive to it is supplied if the poor soul is fired up by an emotion of patriotism for the country or the desire for liberty. If he has a little religious fervour left, without the religious belief, it suits him more to be self-sacrificing as well as fanatical. So the present Godless system of education is primarily responsible for inducing the mentality we so much deplore. A proximity to that mentality is also partly responsible for the soft attitude towards the revolutionary and the terrorist. The incidence of force of the present system of education is

to subordinate the moral motive to the patriotic. It creates a sympathetic attitude for the revolutionary and the terrorist especially when they can do things in the name of the cause of liberty for their country. This fundamental palliative is supplied when there is foreign rule. If Europe cannot get out of this scrape of libertinism, communism and revolt against all authority let it wade its way through as it may. But why force these western banes on the Indian people? Why not allow them to work up on their own cultural lines? Why fight shy of changing the educational outlook altogether? Why not grant a thing which the Indians would like and the government would find more conducive to peace and order?

The second blunder has been the policy of allowing a mischief to grow and fumbling to check it thereafter. There are numerous instances of this type in the history of the press, the platform and organizations. There are papers and books which are spreading diluted communistic or bolshevik ideas to-day. There are so many colleges and universities which are today the breeding ground for the spirit of revolt and revolution. There are bodies and institutions which do the work of preparing the ground and holding the intellectual brief for subversion of the social order. The government evidently does not believe in the virtues of prevention and either handles the disease in its advanced stage, or proves a bad doctor at the cure. It perhaps believes in the political wisdom of a foreign government "governing the least" and it ultimately stumbles upon the necessity of governing with virulence. It would allow the seditious article to be published, institute a case against it after it has done its work, take evidence upon its psychology and sense, and then claps its author into the jail. Why all this? Why not have a publicity-vigilance department and spare the public of the article, and the author of the jail visit? If films

can be censored why not articles ? Why not frankly say that you do not want to give advertising chances to mischief ?

Another blunder of the Government's policy is to expect, demand and work upon agitation, and to give it premium value in the political market. In a country like England where the Government is of native stock and the fights are between one-party and another, that might do. But in India it works just the wrong way. Here the most convenient plea for agitation is opposition to foreign domination. Hence in all general agitations it is used by agitators to get maximum results. It will be noticed that the cleverest political party makes the Government its target, and as one party is not to replace another in Government it implies that the Government always remains on the wrong side with the public. Further the agitation not only feeds upon the premium but thrives by attracting the worst elements of discontent and the extremist gets an added value, while the moderates are side-tracked. This is the evil of ruling by fits and starts of public opinion. Even the world opinion is gathering to the idea of a unitary corporate state with stable ideals. No generation has the right to cast to the winds the precious social and moral inheritance of Mankind's forefathers and deprive their heirs of their valuable rightful heritage. Why not rule India by its accredited laws, institutions, methods and ideals ? Why make it the catspaw of the half-baked reformist who is neither a good Indian nor a good Englishman ? Why leave it to the mercy of new-fangled experiments ? Why thrust the parliamentary democracy in India when it has failed in Europe, only because a few power-hunters or place-hunters want it ? Does the government think that it will in any way please the bulk of agitators ? It would be reform wasted and unwanted if not harmful. Why this overweening anxiety for the White-paper proposals ? Why not say straight—Well, if it is.

reactionary and whole of it wrong, let it go. Let the government just try it. This premium to agitation has another consequence. It is notorious that agitation directly against the government is risky and rather inconvenient; so the experts try to create a general atmosphere of revolt—revolt against religion, social fabric, morals and established values. Is not the Indian India of some of the well-governed Native States going on well in spite of the want of western flippancy and spirit of revolt? India wants Swaraj. Why not give her that on those lines? Why raise up a ghost and then run for allaying it?

The other blunder that the government has been making is to discredit Indian ideals when it is a plain fact that the Western ones would go straight against itself. Why keep on harping upon the western fads of *liberty, equality and democracy*? Are all men equal *de facto*? Why then further a fiction and take a falsehood as the guiding principle? India believes in moral and actual hierarchy in mankind and it is true to facts. Then again, can you give all liberties to all men? It is found impossible in Europe and after parading the slogan for a century and a half it is finding itself enthralled all the more. In fact people have discovered that the cant of liberty was but a cover for the forces of the devil in man which have been since released. Where the fallen Archangel has succeeded he has instituted the worst kind of anti-religious and anti-God dictatorship. At other places man has been obliged to make himself the dictator to keep the devil at a safe distance. India believes in Law godly and spiritual and not in liberties which are only licences in the embryo. Then again the fad of democracy: the rule of the ballot-box which is given the clap-trap name of parliamentary government. It is an old tale that it has failed in Europe except where other potent factors have worked. But look even at the municipalities in India which are

based upon that principle. The question of mismanagement apart, they have been a veritable machinery for *exploiting* the people and squeezing taxes more and more out of them. Democracy in all countries has worked to handbound and exploit the people and has served to degenerate public morals and induce non-moral and immoral philosophies of life. It could hardly be otherwise. For, the principle of the ballot-box is based upon a blatant falsehood that the value of one vote is equal to that of the other. We do not deny that there can be human factors which might work for good in spite of democracy. But democracy is wrong in principle, because the voters, and to wit the representatives, A B C, and hence their votes are not equal in their values and to regard them as equal is to induce a false mentality all through the state.

We may here refer to the consequential dethroning of or jeering at the Eastern ways and methods, which has worked towards keeping facts and real situation away from the government. Hindu and Moslem rulers held open Durbars practically from day to day and heard the people's grievances. Far from undermining the social and religious practices of the people by underhand policy they were scrupulous to a fault in these matters. There, not only all could ventilate their grievances, which is the real essence of the democratic cry, but premium was not set by the dinner-tables. In fact no tables were spread; only *pan gulab* were fixed up on principle, so that the honestest and the staunchest and the natural accredited leaders of the people as well as the social malcontents and outcastes, could have their say. No sane government can be deaf to real grievances though it might or might not respond to ambitions. This would be the real democratic way of meeting the peoples. Democracy, in so far as it is a fine machine for safe taxing is always detested by the people.

These are some of the fundamental blunders of policy which have been helping the growth of lawlessness which is exhibiting itself not only through the revolver, the bomb, the highway robberies but by a general assault upon all forces of discipline and order in the home and the society, in the school and the factory. The whole can be summed up in a nutshell as the result of the policy of *ruling India by the European rule and line*. We want to be ruled by the *Indian rule and line*. In fact the strongest objection to succumbing to the New Constitution is that it would mean simply a change from the white disintegrators to the brown.



Orthodox Hindus and their Rights

No Round Table Conference which is not fully representative of all the great interests and parties in the land can really serve the purpose of the nation. It is but just that the right which the Orthodox Hindu Conference has given expression to should be realised, allowed and acted upon. It is unnecessary to mention that no antagonistic or prejudicial interests should be allowed to interfere with this inherent right of the millions of orthodox Hindus to make themselves heard. It should not be the policy of any judicious Government to put a discount on the opinions of those who mind their business, abide by law and are least boisterous. It is worse to interfere with their religious rights and practices through the acts of heterogeneous legislatures, and to provoke and embitter them unnecessarily. The reasons why the orthodox Hindus should be given an adequate representation are well-known to all those who impartially judge the conditions in India, but they often come to be neglected on account of two reasons. Firstly the opinion of the westernized Hindus some of whom are leaders of the Congress and of the liberal party is misunderstood as the opinion of the Hindus. And secondly, the Hindu Mahasabha is supposed to represent the Hindus in general. The Hindus as Indians are at one with the Congress in the desire for Swarajya as the goal of the country to be achieved as early as possible. But as any student

of politics and constitutions can see, they cannot and do not look at the fundamental political problems of the constitution and their incidence on the balance of parties with the same angle of vision that the westernized Hindus would do. On the other hand the Hindu Mahasabha is a halfway house which has general sympathies with Hindu culture, in which the aggressive political standpoint dominates over the religious ideal and in which Arya Samaj and Brahmo Samaj leanings have a dominating influence. The orthodox Hindu is as far away from the protestant outlook of the religious and social reformer as from the points of view of the Westernized Indian to whom religion is a negligible factor. It may be useful and pertinent to put the reasons for the representation of the orthodox Hindu millions of India, categorically from three points of view. Firstly they ought to be given due and adequate representation on account of the following general considerations:—

(1) They form the bulk of the Hindu population, believing in Hindu religion with its traditional rites, usages and practices.

(2) They are not properly and adequately represented by any other group or party of Indian political thinkers.

(3) They are usually law-abiding and non-agitating, and therefore deserve to be heard all the more sympathetically.

(4) Any constitution that shall be drawn up in spite of them or against them or prejudicial to them shall rouse them up in spite of their passive attitude and make matters worse for India.

(5) Any constitution which may be drawn up with a predominant bias in favour of the Westernized Hindus who form a very small part of the population will be against the political and numerical facts of the country and would react virulently in a democratic constitution.

(6) The future harmony of all Indian interests requires that the orthodox Hindu opinion should be effectively provided for in the making of the new constitution. They are a majority deserving the protection given to minorities.

The reasons why the Hindus cannot be properly and adequately represented by the Hindu leaders of the Congress are the following:—

(1) The dominating angle of visions of the congressmen is different. It is territorial and not cultural.

(2) They have to adjust their opinions with a view to all the predominant interests and opinions in the Congress and to take, as their main clue the line of least resistance within the Congress.

(3) Many of their leaders are wellknown to be at variance with Hindu orthodoxy though they command its respect on account of the effective political work that they are putting in.

(4) The Hindu orthodoxy and Hindu Religious Heads have again and again from time to time protested against the Congress attitude in socio-religious matters, such as Untouchability etc.

The reasons why the Hindu Mahasabha cannot properly and adequately represent the Hindus are as follows:—

(1) There is a predominating Arya Samajist or Brahmo Samajist influence in the Hindu Mahasabha.

(2) The word 'Hindu', being of indefinite connotation, easily lends itself to misunderstandings or misinterpretation. Properly speaking 'Hindu' means a follower of Hinduism and Hinduism means the religion of the Vedas, Smrities, Puranas etc., as traditionally interpreted; and the orthodox Hindus are the

only Hindus properly so called. The Jains, the Arya Samajists, the Brahmo Samajists etc., are rightly separated in the census from the Hindus.

(3) The protestants against the teachings and spirit of Hinduism cannot represent the Hindus merely by the colour of the name.

(4) The Hindu Mahasabha is up for the Hindus as a general heterogeneous community from national and political considerations and hence their outlook is fundamentally political; they lead the resistance against Moslems and the Government but at the same time in religious matters they are out of tune with the Hindus. For instance reconversion, fights for numerical advantage in Councils, propaganda against Untouchability, and countenancing of legislative interference in religious matters are not much in the orthodox Hindu line of thinking.

(5) The Hindus in general were never properly represented in the Hindu Mahasabha, for the Hindus according to the Mahasabha, mean those who follow any of the religions of Indian origin. Thus practically not only the Hindus but the Samajists, the Jains, the Buddhists, the Sikhs etc., come under the description, creating a heterogeneous group and hence the composition of the Mahasabha is inherently muddled. The orthodox Hindus finding their distinctive religious practices at a discount in such a body usually have held separate conferences.

(6) The Hindus are not properly speaking at variance with the Mahomedans keeping to their own religion and do not wish to carry on an aggressive strife against them either in the way of reconversions or squabbles for representation. They would rather wish that the Hindu should be a good Hindu and a Moslem be a good Moslem and both live together in peace by mutual understanding.

(7) Except for some Hindus like Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya who are in the Hindu Mahasabha perhaps in the hope of gathering political strength for the Hindus, the Hindu orthodoxy is hardly there and the Bombay Varnashram Hindu Conference has now by resolution dissociated itself clearly from the Hindu Mahasabha. The Hindu's angle of vision is that he is a Hindu first and an Indian next or rather is an Indian first but Hindu all along.

(8) In devotion to God and traditional religious practices, the Hindu is in line with the Moslem and against all that array of Westernization, materialism and anti-religious propaganda posing under the name of liberalism.

(9) Regarding as he does religion as the divinely ordained Law of Life the Hindu cannot and does not countenance any legislative interference against it and more so from legislatures of a mixed nature including anti-Hindu, non-Hindu or indifferent-Hindu elements.

(10) The Hindu Mahasabha having a predominantly political angle of vision and having to accommodate itself to all the various religions which have no Scripture in common it is *prima facie* and *ab initio* unsuited to represent the Hindus as meaning that Community of Religion which is based on the Vedas, Smrities and the Puranas.

It is far from my thoughts to suggest that any of those great and strong interests like the Arya Samaj, the Sikhs, the Jains and others be without representation in the councils of the realm. They ought to have their proper representation but so also the Hindus must have theirs; and the interest of the one should not be confounded nor exhibited as those of the other. It is the same old tale of the Congress expressing a national standpoint, founded upon the physical location of a

group and then in course of time bodies rising up to represent their own integral cultural unities. The political fiction of unity lasted or lingered till the Congress did not dabble in socio-religious matters and the electoral apple of discord was not thrown out. The Moslems first formed themselves into a party, then the Hindu Mahasabha by way of reaction and further the Sikhs also. The Hindus proper have yet no consolidated party and if consolidated agitation only is the prerequisite for being heard before an assemblage of representatives of a people than the Hindus have indeed lagged behind. They have not yet taken to the new means of agitation and expression which can by sufficient manipulation be made to express even more than what they stand for. If the opinions of the millions of law-abiding orthodox Hindus are to count for anything, then their representatives must be called and heard. These Hindus belong to an age in which the real representative was not of a pushful sort but the one who could be easily pushed aside by roughness or revolt. There are, however, the usual means of calling forth their representatives by a reference to such bodies as the Bharat Dharma Maha Mandal, All India Varnashram Swaraj Sangh, and the great Religious Heads such as the representatives of the *gades* of Shankaracharya, Ramanujacharya, Vallabbacharya, and others. If we want more of harmony ahead, the orthodox Hindu opinion must not be left in the lurch.

The anomaly of the situation is that there are numerous Hindus in the Congress, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Liberal Federation; and the Moslems and other onlookers therefore think that the Hindus are over-represented. Most of these Hindus, however, are prepossessed with the Western view of life; theirs is not the essentially Hindu cultural standpoint and a lot of energy is spent in the fights over communal and electoral problems. The Hindus as such find themselves unrepresented. They

would very probably insist more on thorough guarantees for religious autonomy for themselves in the constitution and absolute non-interference in their religious and socio-religious practices, laws and usages. They would willingly wish the same privileges guaranteed to their brother-Moslems. They would wish that the constitution is not formed in such a way as to foist on the people a so-called nationalist but in effect a communistic culture through weightage in legislature or education. Granted this the Hindu-Moslem questions can be easily and amicably adjusted and solved.

It is hardly necessary to reiterate that the Indian National Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha have indeed rendered signal services to the cause of the country and the cause of the Hindus positively and negatively, but I mean to point out that their general attitude is not fundamentally, representatively, and distinctively Hindu. It cannot be, by their very constituent factors and policy. The fundamental, constitutional questions as they affect the Hindus proper, are not and cannot be properly represented by them, and therefore unless the accredited representatives of the orthodox Hindus are given their due importance in a Council or Conference, it cannot be properly representative of the millions of Hindus living in the land.

28th June 1930. }



The Sanatanist Movement

The orthodox Hindus or Sanātānists have now entered the political arena as Sanātānists. They have to. They cannot afford to be left in the lurch. They cannot afford to be safe non-entities. They cannot afford to be isolated. They have to be adequately and proportionately powerful. They have to work hand in hand with the other patriotic parties and communities in the country. The position assumed by the Congress may belong to them. They are the majority community. They are truly Indian in ideals and aspirations. They are the purest representatives of India's cultural integrity.

Sanātānists means Hindus. Hindus means those believing in Sanātān Dharma or Hinduism. Hinduism means the religion based on the Shāstras faithfully interpreted. The 'Shāstras' means the Vedas, Smritis, Puranas and other Agamas. Jains are Hindus by misunderstanding. The Arya Samajists and Brahmo Samajists are Hindus by courtesy. The non-scheduled reformers are pseudo-Hindus in spite of themselves. The Samajists are the results of the first reactions of the Western impact. They must join the main old stream if they want their boasted culture not to be swept off. Playing tactics against the Sanatanists is for them ultimately suicidal. The reformers are easy-going people to whom religion does not much matter. They do not know what they believe in and stand for. They hardly realize that they are enjoying

the advantages of a religious society. They are the waylaid sheep going westward. They have simply got to know which is which and whereunto.

The other communities in the country are the Moslems, Shikhs, Christians, Parsis &c. A good Hindu is a natural friend to a good Moslem and so also about the others. They have the same spiritual affinities. If these be emphasized and the differences be left to themselves the brotherhood of all these communities would be all the easier. Religious piety is their common bond of sympathy. The onrush of a frankly anti-God and anti-religious Communism or Bolshevism is the great urge for the co-operation of these religious communities in their self-defence. The instance of Turkey shows that even the Moslems with all their piety and strength find it difficult to stand against the onslaught of western revolutionary ideas. The Indian Moslems and Shikhs are fundamentally religious, and hence they always differ in their viewpoints from the Congress, which is avowedly non-religious and practically anti-religious; its object being to drown all religious communities into a secular national unitary ideal implying the dethronement of the religious ideal and all that it connotes. Such a secular ideal has always fitted ill with the Indian conditions and its patched up unions have not even been strong enough to deceive the foreign rulers. It is naturally so, because the fact of the existence of communities—integral and robust in themselves—is sought to be suppressed. India is practically a sub-continent. Indian conditions require all communities to federate, co-operate and sympathize with one another. India needs a Federation of Communities, not a merger.

The Varnāshram Swarājya Sangh is now the premier religio-political organization of the Sanātānist. The Varnashram Sangh was originally a religious body. The addition of the word Swarājya introduced the germ of politics in it. The germ

developed through combating the notorious Sarda Bill. It did not succeed in the fight but it grew from more to more. It had to fight even against internal antagonisms. Fortunately for it came the Temple-entry fight. In that fight it stood to its guns and gave the defeat to the biggest political leader and most astute agitator of India. Guruvayur became its first field of victory.


The sharp eye of the Government perceived that here was the one force in India which had not only brains and boldness enough to differ from Mr. Gandhi but had power even to give him a defeat. Here was a superior religious force. Here were men before whom in abstinence, uprightness and spiritual life Mr. Gandhi was not quite ahead. And Mr. Gandhi was developing into a Communist under the new circle of surroundings. His robe became gradually transparent. Non-violent Non-cooperation and Civil Disobedience were soon found out to be a cover for revolt and revolution. He said he was a Sanatanist of Sanatanists while he was railing at their sacred scriptures, trying to practically desecrate their temples, and was striking a blow at the very Hindu Social order. It was this sailing under false colours that the Sanatanists resented. No man can humbug all the people all the time. The country was asked to gag itself before the Simon Commission and to boycott the R. T. Conference. But the Congress did place the Nehru-report—a complete statement of views before the Government and the Congress leader did attend the R. T. Conference. The boycott was, presumably, to be observed by others.

But the Sangh had quarrel neither with the Congress nor with its Dictator. Its quarrel was with the anti-Indian—because anti-religious—attitude of the great man who passed before the outer world for the symbol and example of the Indian spirit and civilization. To rise up against the fundamentals of the great Indian religion and culture such as its social order and

its purity-regulations was much in itself. But to it was added the Poona-pact,—a flagrant injustice done by the most improper means of emotional coercion. Many Hindu leaders were taken in. The Sangh, however, stood aloof and raised its objection. The hypnotism has gradually disappeared and the Sangh has proved to have had the better discretion.

But the Sangh though an opponent of revolutionary forces was not prepared to be submerged amongst the loyalists. This is the key to the attitude of the government towards it, which is cautious—neither very favourable nor unfavourable. The Sangh which had no place at the R. T. C. was allowed to send seven witnesses before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. But the orthodox Hindus had not yet been sufficiently alive to the potentialities of the Sangh and only three could go,—Mr. M. K. Acharya (ex-M. L. A.) the strongest and the most virulent fighter amongst them. The government thus put its seal on the political potentiality of the Sangh.

The question then is what does the Sangh stand for? To those who are for the principles which brought it into existence, and not for making it a pawn or pivot for ulterior personal ends, its main creed is not difficult to determine. It represents Hindu Conservation of ideals—religious, social and political—in consonance with the spirit of India's ancient Civilization and Religion. Its central and centripetal force is its fidelity to Hindu culture as interpreted by the whole spirit of the Shastras. In methods of combating disintegrating tendencies it can afford to be up to date, in principles it can accept no compromise. To work out the main details of its political, economic, social and educational creed and to present it before the country as a four-square scheme of things, is the great task that lies before the Sanatanist leaders of to-day



The Temple-Entry Push

The Congress has already committed an egregious blunder by including the anti-untouchability propaganda, over a purely religious matter, in its programme; and the *Government would surely be wise enough not to follow* its clue. The policy of Religious Non-interference implies *not* that the Government would help others to interfere. It is plainly the duty of the Government to thwart all such attempts as would create schisms and group enmities where there were none and which would force so called reforms against the religious conscience of the people.

It is now sufficiently known which way the wind of 'Reform' has blown and what things the word may be made to cover. The Hindus do not want to give up their civilization and most of them not even the *shouchachar* (purity-regulations) whose want has been specially mentioned as the distinguishing feature of the Asuri life in the Bhagwad Gita (Chap XVI. 7).

It is indeed unfortunate that at the present time when there is need of unity in the country a matter has been raked up which would stir on and accentuate differences. What is or can be, we ask, the spirit of the Poona-pact ? Is it to make the untouchables and the other caste-Hindus more united or to force Hindus to a further division by an organized attack on their religious and purity-usages ? No tyranny can be more intolerable than tyranny over men's religious conscience. It behoves the rectitude of Syt. Gandhiji that he should make it clear:

(1) That his efforts are aimed against ill-treatment of the Untouchables and for their amelioration and not against men's conscientious and honest practices for personal or social and religious purity,

(2) that the movement is intended not to induce the break up of the Hindu social order but is meant for cementing the ranks of Hinduism,

(3) that proper systematic inquiries should be made in the matter and then only necessary efforts made to bring the mutual conduct of various castes, in line with the spirit of religious fraternity and that of the shastric purity; and

(4) That this being a purely internal religious matter of the Hindus, coercion from people who do not believe in Hinduism should not be countenanced and the reviling of the Shastras and orthodoxy should be thoroughly disapproved as both unjust and undignified.

Nobody claims that the conduct of men towards men is, or ever was, quite ideal. Individuals may have their own weaknesses and there may be lapses where millions of men are counted in a creed. It is the lot of the human race to stumble and yet to strive for a noble moral ideal. But short-sightedness alone can indulge in sweeping indictments as may have harmful repercussions on men's personal and social purity, and which may be used as initial handles for the destruction of the social order. There is room enough, keeping the religious principle of contactual purity intact, to work for the betterment and amelioration of the untouchables. We are not ready to fling mud at our people for little or imaginary faults from the western standpoint and thus to paralyze our national self-reverence. All peoples have enigmatic features of their own.

The Sangh has asserted its mind again and again that the Antyajas or untouchables as they are called, are our fellow-

brethren belonging to Hindu religion. We know that they have faith enough in Hinduism not to run away from it on account of untouchability which they also regard as their duty to maintain and to help their Hindu brethren in maintaining, according to religion. Regarding the bogey of their conversion, to allay further fears, we may note that there are dissenting creeds such as the Arya Samaj and Brahmo Samaj, calling themselves Hindu, which can readily take up the untouchables, provided, of course, the untouchables prefer them to Islam or Christianity. We are for their amelioration, and this amelioration can be achieved by nothing so much as by the revival and continuance of religious practices. It need hardly be repeated that the practices relating to those castes in the daily *Vaishnavadeva*, Hindu festivals, eclipse-days, ceremonial occasions from marriage and birth to death, and systematic doles in villages, all bear testimony to our good-will and regard for them. We recommend princes and people alike to revive and continue these long-established, direct and universal methods of ameliorating the economic condition of the untouchables so that the full value of charity may go to them. Their moral condition has also to be improved. But effective steps will be more possible in this direction when some of our westernized leaders shall cease becoming models to them in the use of the wine-glass and the 'new morality' of Communism.

To the Hindu who has stood against the breaking of images in the past centuries there is nothing startling in the pollution of temples, and *teerthas*. He knows too well that it has been so prophesized by the Seers of old. We are only pained to see that it comes up so soon and that Shriyut Gandhiji and Pandit Malaviyaji should be doing the spade-work of such a consummation.

Perhaps it could scarcely be otherwise. For, people could hardly have lent their ear to any but those who have lived in

the spirit of Hinduism. We cherish the great political work of Gandhiji, we recognize in him a patriot and an idealist of the highest order and just therefore with fewer misgivings, we try to hope that he would distinguish between untouchability and ill-will and lift his ban without inducing such a fight as was put up against the boycott of schools, colleges and law-courts. In this matter his victory, we believe, would be his defeat; for, it would be a victory against men's dearest conscience. We cannot but deeply feel and it pains us to note that our other great patriot and statesman Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, from whom we have always expected better orthodoxy has been swelling the tidal current. We cannot forget that history is replete with instances of great personalities unconsciously leading peoples' enthusiasms into wrong channels. Even so did the evangelizing Martin Luther give rise to the protestant revolt against the very foundations of Christianity and the devout Bacon did to science-robed materialism against the spirit of religion altogether.

This is an hour of trial. The orthodoxy shall have to carry on the fight, with righteousness and self-restraint, in that self-same brotherly-spirit and unflinching loyalty to principles which are the glory of our race. Gandhiji is dear to us but Religion is dearer still. May God guide us aright.



A New System of Representation

Democracy is one thing, Representation is another. The need of one may be acknowledged without granting the need of the other. Democracy implies the sovereignty of the people. Sovereignty of the people is supposed to imply the Rule of the Majority, which in its turn implies that the value of each vote is uniformly the same. This basis of democracy may be objected to on the score of facts and justice and its value may be questioned on the ground of its costliness, inefficiency or failure. But there are perennial grounds for the Representation of the views of the People before the Sovereign. Under the modern conditions of the State, the constitution, laws, justice and administration may need people's views in a representative character and the views may be very useful to the State. Thus without premising the democratic ideal, proper representation can be an acceptable aim.

We need not enter here into the theory of representation, as, our immediate concern is to consider how to make the representative system more perfect by making it more natural, more definite, more diffused, more honest and more expressive of those whom it claims to represent. The test of its fidelity is its faithful reflection of the people's actual views, sentiments, desires, and aspirations.

How then can there be a proper representation ? What should be its fundamental basis ? Is the State justified in forcing upon the people to vote under an arbitrary system of grouping ? Is there no system of voting better than those at present in vogue that can be more in consonance with human needs and aspirations ? If so what can be its fundamental principle ?

The Voluntary Principle, I think may very advantageously be substituted for the present one in all possible directions in the representative machinery. And just for the sake of facility the decimal scale may be adopted. We may explain the application of the principle by illustrations. The voluntary principle can be set to work in five ways *viz.* (1) in claiming the vote (2) in grouping or association for voting (3) in selecting the representative (4) in timings of polling and (5) in the method of voting. Let us take it that there are thirty million people in a province or unit of country, and that out of them ten million are adults—male and female. Now under the proposed system any hundred adults can voluntarily associate themselves to register their votes in favour of a person. They would simultaneously vote for him, in his presence—certainly at his instance—at any magistrate's office in the town or village, on any day in a specified week, say the first week of January. The complete list in due form with a common affidavit by the signatory—voters that they have not voted for anybody else in the election, that they are above 21 years of age, that they belong to the area of the franchise, and that they are not otherwise disqualified, may be handed in by the candidate to the magistrate who has simply to make them put their signatures or thumb impressions in his presence in the presented sheet. Let us suppose that fifty thousand groups of hundred each (i. e. five million adults) choose to vote and elect fifty thousand candidates. This gives us our first elected persons and

let us call them for the sake of convenience, *Representatives*. A similar process with some alterations to which we shall presently refer, will give us delegates and deputies. In the first election the registering magistrate's locality of jurisdiction may be made the residential limit for the electorate.

Let us analyse what this process so far means and implies. It means suffrage for those adults who want it or are alive to it. It means a set-back to caucuses, corruptions and coercions which large electorates involve and necessitate. It means that the candidate has certainly one hundred persons behind him. It means there is an exact record of the persons for whom he stands. It implies that there is no wastage of votes against which the preferential system is sought as a partial remedy. It implies that homogeneous and cognate groups shall be more at home in this natural grouping system. It implies that voting strength will rise in proportion to the needs of the situation and the growing political consciousness of the people. It means that we are introducing not an arbitrary or cross-division of sex, tax, or property but a cementing force in the election machinery. It means also that these same hundred men can say when necessary that the representative is not representing them on a particular issue when he may be wrongly posing to do so.

We now reach the second step in the system. The fifty thousand representatives as we have called them shall in their turn combine in groups of ten each from amongst themselves. The primary voters have done their work. Now the Representatives do theirs *mutatis mutandis*. The unit of locality may now be extended to the whole province, and first class magistrates may be polling officers. An easy time ought to be left between the first election and the second so that the electors may crystal-

live themselves into groups. This second election can therefore be, say, in the first week of March i. e. two months after the first. These fifty thousand electors need not necessarily elect from out of themselves. This course I think advisable on two grounds. Firstly, why limit the voluntary principle as regards its choice? There may be men who may not like to pass through various sieves of election and yet may be acceptable as leaders of the nation. Then again, the greater the uncertainty about the candidate's clutching the power of effective operation the less will be the temptations and chances to distilled bribery and corruption. The candidate spends twenty thousand because he knows he would make up for the amount if he got in. The chance of an outsider coming in at any stage would lessen the temptation to over-confidence. This question is however complex, and deserves greater study and experience before final settlement.

Let us take it that about five thousand groups of ten each vote during the stipulated week of the second election. This reduction of the quota of voters from hundred to ten will be appreciated even on a cursory view of the facts involved. The internal homogeneity cannot be so great in these groups and each elector here is not a representative merely of himself but of a hundred. If large masses of population are to be dealt with, the question of groups of one hundred each might deserve consideration on the grounds of expediency but ordinarily from the second election onward voluntary groups of ten each may be considered judicious and advantageous. The five thousand candidates thus elected by the second election may be called *Delegates* as they may be taken to be representatives by delegation.

The same process may be repeated *mutatis mutandis* in the third election. Here the elected candidate, whom we may call *Deputy* shall be representing, roughly speaking, ten dele-

gates i. e. one hundred representatives or ten thousand voters. For populations which are not likely to present more than five-million voters these three elections would suffice and their principal Chamber would then consist of about five hundred deputies which would not be an unreasonable number in a respectable house. Thus a country with about five million voters would not need a further elective sifting.

But in cases where large sub-continents like India are concerned either a further process of sifting may be necessary or the Government may have to select from amongst the deputies the requisite number. It may be said that the same number of elections would suffice if in the second or third or both the elections the voting groups be made of one hundred each. I think however that it is not very desirable. For, representation, to be real, needs more contact of the electors and the elected *inter se*. Further, the process of election would gain advantage by being spread over a longer time and becoming a part of normal routine. It would tend to reduce or eliminate the campaigning and hurried assaults which are a feature of the modern elective machinery. The fourth election in this way would give us representatives who may be called senators or councillors; and they will represent, roughly speaking a hundred thousand voters each. It may be noticed in passing that there need not be any serious objection to this system on the score of the indirect nature of the representation. Because any representation to be even moderately satisfactory and faithful must postulate very small groups and homogeneous ones. The first representatives in our cadre will be of the most reliable type. Thereafter the voluntary grouping is the only method which will give a better advantage to the voter in knowledge, personal contact and judgment about the candidate for election.

This then seems to be a more natural and advantageous system for bringing people together for giving their advice, opinion, verdict or mandate. This freedom of grouping is more necessary in a large country with heterogeneous elements of population. The Moslems and Sikhs, for instance in India need not be blamed if they desire to be allowed to keep to their normal social groups. It will be seen that this system incidentally solves the problem of communal electorates and appreciates the urge for social solidarity. It does not create a community (v. l. depressed class electorates) nor does it rule them out of count. It leaves the freedom and facility to people to associate in groups most convenient to them. It induces a sort of social fraternity of relationships where the modern system tends to create bitterest hatreds. It also automatically leaves to the woman the option to dive into politics or to be the Queen of the Home.

There remains only one question of the 'left outs' to be dealt with. It may be argued that there will be several people left out who are desirous to vote but who cannot get into a group of hundred. I think however that it is just here that this system shall be a great impetus and inducement for contact and cooperation. It is more or less an automatic system in which the representative's background is more definite and more uniform. Its *representatives* in a general assembly can even work for a plebescite on an important issue.

We may add that for the greater realization of the fundamental objects of representative institutions, the Representatives in the above scheme may be given the power of submitting written representation to the chamber for consideration; and the delegates be given the privilege to speak in the chamber (without being its members) on an issue specially concerning them after due notice and president's permission. It may be

remembered that one of the rampant evils of the modern representative system is that once one has managed to get in, not only the people's interests are neglected but there is the killing of the fatted calf with a vengeance. Who would say that if it were left to their free plebescite, the people would allow or vote for such lavish expenditures and such heavy taxes as the so called representatives nowadays think it right to impose or sanction ? The facts on this matter alone are sufficient to indicate how little these representatives are proper representatives. It shows at any rate that there is something fundamentally wrong with our present systems, that give us results which are, to put it mildly, rather unexpected on a common sense view of people's opinions.

We may in conclusion summarize the main points of the system. It is based on the voluntary principle in grouping. It needs no nominations, no expensive machinery for election lists and polling booths. It makes for a closer touch between the electors and the elected. It incidentally uses the decimal system. It is likely to reduce the many unfortunate features of the present systems by making the elective process more diffused and normal as well as less amenable to mere chance.



A Delta in Crisis

One is inclined to think and wonder as to how when the Government is trying to give more of what is called self-government, discontent and spirit of revolt are increasing. The root cause seems to be the Western education comined with the democratic system. Both are unsuited to the condition of the country. The new system gives the greatest opportunity for agitation against the government under the plea and camouflage of election campaign. This fact is becoming plainer by the avowal of the political agitators that there are only two parties in the country—the Congress and the Government. It may be noted in this connection that the word Government, to the man in the street, does not mean this or that party in power; it means the power by law and constitution established viz, the British Government. This will be more transparent on realising the fact that “independence” and overthrow of the constitution is made the election-cry by the prevailing party. The majority of the people being not prone to make minute differentiations and being led more by abstract ideas than by practical calculations the issue “whether independence or present Government” is effective as well as suggestive. It is all the more so, when such catchwords as freedom, liberty and the like are the prevailing notes of education. Independence being conveniently fixed up as a code-word, the extremist party gets most sympathy and there remains no hope for any other party except

that a strong candidate here or there who is abnormally potent in a particular locality may become successful. It happens all the more so when the plea of one popular front is held up; for the people know that the Government with its numerous resources is powerful, and they also know that the extremists can give it the greatest pinch. In fact the whole machinery seems to be rather misconceived and I am afraid, may go against the calculations of its makers. What is the remedy, it may be asked? I am here analysing the situation rather than proposing a remedy, but I might say that in a country like India, the franchise for representing views, should be extended to the widest possible limits, but the constituted councils should be advisory bodies from which the real and the faked views can be sifted and Government in accordance with the people's real interests and ideas may be possible. Otherwise such anomalies and tragedies as a practical communist at the head of the biggest and the most effective political party in a conservative, religious and law-respecting country, would be a natural consequence. Political power under such conditions becomes the great temptation and opportunity of all revolutionary forces, which can easily make a *prima-facie* case against the constitutional power in a country situated like India. If the country is to be saved from a communist revolution which would sweep in its tide India's best heritage and culture and would make disorder the order of the day, the *sine-qua-non* of every representative of a council constituted under the Government, should be fidelity to the Government and constitution by law established and a pledge to work it honestly and faithfully. Otherwise no constitution whatever, can receive a fair trial, and the so called progress would lead to class-war, discontent and revolt.

There is another important point, which also deserves attention. The representatives of one tenth of the people will

take time to be fit to represent also the remaining nine-tenths, who have either no vote or have failed to use it. The interests and views and ideals of these should not be allowed to go by default. The point receives more emphasis when we perceive that there is to-day a conflict of ideals, civilizations and cultures in India. He who runs can read how remote the new political agitators are, from the views that are prevalent in this country, which owing to the streams of ancient civilization and western culture on either side, and the rising tide of a God-less communistic sea in the front, has become a veritable Delta in Crisis.



Religious Non-Interference

If we can take it that the British people know that we are principally a *religiously-minded people* and that H. M. the Queen Empress Victoria wisely made Religious Non-interference the corner-stone of her great Proclamation, we are thrown on the natural conclusion that somehow or other, matters have got so muddled that what was the glory of the British Rule and is the fundamental issue with the people is being left in the lurch. Without meaning any disrespect to the ability of the British Indian Deligation, we are constrained to say that we regret the absence of the vindication of this life-breath of the Indian people at the Round Table Conferences.

We claim that all the religious communities of India desire such a safeguard and that we have a right to such a statutory provision on the following grounds amongst others :—

- (1) It is our immemorial right established by scriptures and usages
- (2) It is established by constitutional principles internationally recognised.
- (3) The right is founded on the Royal Proclamation of the First British Sovereign of India and those of her successors.
- (4) It is indirectly allowed and practically provided for by the recognition of custom in the present law of the land.

- (5) It alone can guarantee the abiding interests and integral cultures of the people.
- (6) It is eminently expedient for the safety of and harmony amongst the people.
- (7) It ought to be guaranteed in entirety by the hitherto trustees of the people when the power is to be transferred to an imperfect, undisciplined and untried democracy.

It is hardly necessary for us to dilate on these important points. Manu the great Hindu Law-giver expressly states that "The Sovereign was created as the *Protector of the people in their respective religious practices.*" (Chap. VII, 35). The British Indian Government did pursue this policy and even dispensed justice with the help of Pundits and Kazies; and the Indian States did the same till the Government set up the example of allowing religious-interference by such acts as the Child-Marriage Restraint Act of 1929.

Further, we presume that the aim of the 'protection of minorities' provisions, set up under the League of Nations, is the guaranteeing of the religious and cultural rights of *all* people, it being assumed that the majority are provided for, in their majority vote. When however a democratic constitution is contemplated, in which diversities of creeds, races, interests, and cross-currents are likely to create queer and unexpected groupings and balances of influence, in which a large majority is not granted suffrage at all, and with whose intricacies, vagaries and artifices the people are not conversant, such a guarantee becomes necessary for majority-communities as well. It may commonly happen that the representatives sent usually for defending general interests may not be well-inclined towards a particular religious practice, or they may be dissenters from orthodox faith or may be of a different religion altogether and may adversely affect

the interest and opinions of the community. The Hindu majority therefore needs such a safeguard.

With regard to the Royal Proclamation, we are aware that nowadays the relevant clauses are interpreted as merely the incidental expressions of the Royal—even personal—good-will. But till lately they were followed by the Government in their full spirit until other considerations weighed with them in allowing religious interference under the ostensible plea that the people's representatives were themselves responsible for the legislation—in dire neglect of the important and outstanding facts that they were *not* the elected representatives of *all* the people concerned, they were never elected on any such issue to the Legislatures nor by communal electorates, and the generality of people remained in the hope that the Government would not allow any meddling in the long-established policy. The present law strongly recognizes custom and hence many of our rights stand protected but that law being liable to change, the need of laying down such a Fundamental Right is all the greater. Religion must be regarded as more venerable than custom.

With reference to the need for the protection of our religions and culture we may say that the danger against which we request the Government to provide, is not imaginary. Not only are challenges thrown in our teeth and religious reform plans (to reform us *out of* religion, in time) already laid out, but there are more facts to show that the danger is real. Ideas of *Communism* and *Bolshevism* (which is, by the way, frankly anti-God and anti-religious) are being preached by several influential circles; and associations are formed to wreck the established order of our society. We think that the present unsatisfactory atmosphere for religion even in Europe will make it easy to understand the situation prevailing in India, though perfect parallels may not be assumed. We may be allowed

to state that we do not cherish the anti-religious progress of Europe and would fain avoid the repetition of the experiments here. We believe that the European ideas and civilization are now in an unsettled nebulous condition, that they involve a moral crisis, perhaps a social revolution and tyrannous dictatorship. The harmless *right we seek for is to be allowed to continue in our own religious and cultural heritage* This does not involve of course any restriction on the freedom of those who disown their allegiance to the community or religion

We need hardly point out that religion being the Fundamental Basis of practical human morals and a force for law, discipline and order, it is the interest of the state as well as the people that it should be respected and protected. Sometimes this aspect, we are aware, is reversed and free-thinkers utilize the differences of the religions *inter se*, for the purpose of prejudicing and discrediting religion itself. Without pressing the fact that countries with much less of religion are not more peaceful, we may point out that religious misunderstandings and animosities can be best reduced by the policy of giving thorough protection to all religions in their proper spheres, so that they may feel safe and secure. To induce a condition in which all of them may be insecure and one can be played against the other, would be, we submit, to play the wrong game. The Montague-Chelmsford Report points out that "We must take them (differences of races and creeds) into account as representing a feature of Indian society which is out of harmony with the ideas on which elsewhere in the world representative institutions rest. We have no intention of interfering with questions of a religious nature or bound up with religious belief *which it is the duty* of the Government so far as possible to *respect and leave alone.*" To stretch the argument of religious differences ~~to discredit~~ religions altogether would be a misuse of the normal

facts for an unwarranted conclusion. We need hardly reiterate the fact that under the Western education, Indian cultures and religions have received rude shocks and have been subjected to most deplorable misunderstandings; which in turn have resulted in some cases in the reformer's attitude of remodelling them by the Western models. This Western materialistic influence is against the grain and spirit of the people and this foisting of revolutionary and iconoclastic bent on the Indian intellect is a standing wrong which can only be, though partially, remedied by the guarantee asked for.

We have to respectfully submit that the Indian communities should have *the right, freedom and faculty to follow their own respective codes of law, to direct their own education and to continue their own religious rites, practices and usages*. We should like to have a *federation* not a *fusion* much less a confusion of our cultures. Under the circumstances therefore we hold all avowedly mixed and heterogeneous legislatures as absolutely unsuited and incompetent to decide on questions relating to religious matters. We submit that handing over that power to them would be both unjust and anti-democratic; for, it would mean the hindering of the community's natural development by the votes of others. We have to request therefore that such *guarantee* or safeguard *should be provided for by a statutory provision* so that there may be no doubt as to its legality or authority; It should be *set down amongst the Fundamental Rights* so as to be unalterable and inviolable. It should be *expressed unambiguously* so as to convey two principles viz. (1) *That all religions shall be respected and equal facilities shall be given to all* and (2) *that there shall be perfect religious non-interference and liberty of conscience in religious action*. We desire that there be no loopholes which might admit of surreptitious, insidious or indirect attempts for side-tracking,

discouraging or eliminating religion from the life of the people. Besides the already intended provision that no disabilities should attach to any person on account of his religion there should be the understanding that if educational or other facilities are granted by the state in the matter of religion such facilities should be equally extended to all who are willing to take advantage thereof.

We may now, reply in brief to some of the objections usually raised against the proposed provision. It is argued that it would mean the *limiting of the powers of the legislature*. Without entering into the theory of the relations of the Religion to the State we may suggest that while the state represents *power embodied*, religion represents the *directing guidance* unto human life, and we submit that the experience of the modern times in no way supports us in throwing the 'directing guidance' at the mercy of the 'embodied power.' But even from the more practical view of the facts that (1) India is a land of many communities and many religions, (2) that its legislatures shall necessarily be of a heterogeneous character, (3) that the balances of powers and the personal predilections of the party in power may oscillate in any direction, and (4) that only an imperfect partial representative system is proposed, we submit that there is every justification for placing such a statutory limitation on the powers of the new legislatures.

Then we come to the objection that the majorities need no safeguards. The Report of The Round Table Conference (Third Session) recognizes the importance attached to a chapter on Fundamental Rights (p. 63) but the real issue with which the orthodox Hindus are concerned is, we are afraid, missed. For in this case it is not a question of safeguarding a minority against a majority but that of safeguarding a majority against the inroads of those who are elected merely on secular issues.

to a secular legislature, in view of their political abilities, by a heterogeneous electorate. Further by the special weightages given to this that and the other interest the majorities are practically reduced to minorities. But the main answer to the objection is that these communities are not grouped as communities in the electorates and hence the cross divisions and counter-currents that are inevitable would not allow the representatives to be representatives of the communities as such. In this connection attention may be drawn to the protest that the orthodox Hindus have made against the recognition of the Poona Pact, at the All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangh Conference, at Guruvayur. It deserves serious notice that under certain induced conditions the orthodox Hindus might come to be in a minority.

It is argued that social and religious spheres cannot be separated from the other spheres of the national life. But to assume one nationality, when there are several distinct clear-marked communities with their own separate cultures, is to beg the question. India is a sub-continent; it has several nationalities, peoples or communities living in it and it is preposterous to induce conditions to break down their respective cultures and social systems for an airy revolutionary dream of one common social life. The State is for preserving what the people hold best and dearest, and this cannot be left to the changable vote of so-called representatives much less to a legislature which is heterogeneous in its composition. The assumption of social concepts and beliefs common to all which should be allowed to be translated into law even against religion is gratuitous and cannot stand practical test. But, what is more, while such imaginary, tentative, revolutionary concepts are not worth a constitution and have not lasted even a couple of generations, the religions which are the basic principles of the *community-idea* have a

moral foundation and have stood as the inspirers of the best of mankind through ages and centuries.

It is argued sometimes that while a foreign Government may safely and wisely keep to the policy of religious non-interference, an elected representative legislature can introduce any changes whatsoever affecting even religion. The weaknesses not only of democratic regime but also of democratic principles are by this time so notorious that we believe they hardly need repetition. Democracy is based on the open violation of the truths that one vote is not equal to another and that one man cannot really and properly represent a host of men in all their variety of opinion. Majority has no right to rule the minority in point of the moral or religious ideal,—the State being herein, a mere artifice for attacks *inter se*. To assume the secular State as the general disposer of human life is to confound the end with the means; more so in case of a *party-manned parliamentary democracy* and still more so in a country of numerous communities and cultures. It is sometimes argued that the representatives of a community may be presumed to have a right to initiate *social* legislation. But the plea is fallacious because such representatives, we may be allowed to repeat, are neither representatives *de jure* of the community nor their representatives *de facto*. The Hindus, for instance, are not to be elected by their communal electorate but a mixed one of Hindus, Jains, Parsis, Brahmos, Christians and others. They are elected, further, for carrying on the normal business and not for representing the community in internal religious or communal matters which are the proper sphere of the Religious Heads of the community. This, we say no doubt for the communities. It is plain, as we have already pointed out, that those who renounce their community and without forming any principles of their own are prepared to delegate their rights with regard to their own social

structure to the State, may be allowed to do so. We are sure that even our more reformed friends of the Arya Samaj and Brahmo Samaj would find it going hard with them under an anti-God Bolshevic dictatorship.

We do not propose to discuss here the theoretic question as to whether religion includes politics or *vice versa*. Indeed, under the old theory, religion being the ultimate guide of all and whole human life, it included politics. On the other hand the secular state while tolerating religion avoids even its formal recognition, except incidentally. We believe, however, that under the present conditions as in India, religions in general should be respectfully recognised by the state and they should be left to themselves in their internal discipline and order except when they interfere with the sacred duties of each other. We can accept only that view of nationalism which is complementary to religions and not antagonistic to them. The State we believe is for the preservation of the *moral ideal*; and religion is its definition—both *enunciation* and *limitation*—accepted by the people concerned. If the people are the state the *religions of the people* must be taken as the *religions of the state*. No proper nationalism can run counter to the prevailing trend of the heart and soul of the people.


It is said by some that nothing should be allowed to come in the way of democracy. But this pose in favour of democracy is both unjustifiable and repugnant to experience. Democracy has failed in Europe and it has failed signally in India. The problem now is rather to make democracy safe for the world, so ruinous has it been to morals, economy and strength of the State. The guarantee we ask for is all the more necessary because a democratic constitution wholly against the traditions and cultures of the people is sought to be imposed upon the country. It is not for us here to protest against a system to which the

Government seem to have committed themselves. We cannot, but state however, that not only our people have no faith in democracy and to them self-government does not necessarily mean democratic parliamentary system, but they feel that it will be a too costly affair for them and will create and increase bitternesses; they feel it to be an apple of discord, being as it is a system that knowingly cultivates competition, accelerates antagonism of classes and envenoms the fights of parties. In spite of all white-washings of theory, democracy is essentially the rule of the majority, the principle of might, and is all the more dangerous when the majority becomes aggressive or resorts to dictatorship. This democratic constitution has made us more distrustful of its tendencies especially because so far as realized by the experience of the people they have been not to advance the country on its own cultural lines but to estrange and side-track it from the same. It may be mentioned that while some westernized nationalists want religious and ancient cultural structure to be levelled down under a Western democratic drive, the whole of religious India wants to conserve and maintain the same. We want therefore that the constitution should not be potentially inimical to the communal idea.

The matter is of such vital and general importance that it would be good to reflect upon some of the more likely consequences of omitting the safeguard prayed for. It may be easy to shirk off the thing on the plea that religion is nowadays on the sliding scale. We are also aware that advantage is being taken of the general prejudice of Christians against other religions to exclude them from proper recognition and legal protection. But all who have experience of Indian conditions will bear out that religion is a very important factor in the lives of Indians, that revolutionaries and reformers will in course of time try their hands at new-fangled reforms on their own lines and

bitterness and clashes amongst the people will increase. As a consequence there is bound to be an enormous discontent amongst even religious and law-abiding people, and it hardly needs mention that the discontent will be heartily exploited by revolutionary forces against the Government itself. The fundamental responsibility will lie on those who made the constitution to suit such acceleration of discontent. On the other hand in the absence of such a safeguard our religion and society shall be more and more prone to insidious and indirect and even direct attacks of the social, political and economic revolutionaries; and under a potent dictatorship a process of levelization can be so speeded up that it may bring about results intensely mischievous and even against the general good of the country itself.

We want therefore strong and constitutional protection against efforts tending to the disruption of our cultures and sabotage of our spiritual civilization. The result of iconoclastic and materialistic reforms on Western lines can hardly be in any way helpful even to the British. Religion would be discredited but Christianity cannot take its place, and under a predominantly secular and non-moral regime, immoral ways and crimes will surely increase and the people shall be a prey to a gradual process of disorder, disunion and dissolution. It is not for us to apprise the Government of the fact that the New Constitution is not likely to be applauded by the people but such a provision therein will at any rate make the people reconcile themselves to the situation. It will keep the people and their religions alive and it shall save India to carry on her great mission as the spiritual torch-bearer of humanity. The British Government's attitude in this matter shall be the crucial test of their desire to stand by the people in the protection of their dearest heritages.



Carlyle on Modern Democracy

Carlyle is one of the most powerful writers of the last century. He was a man cast in the Asiatic mould of thought, and his writings, therefore appeal the more especially to us. He influenced Ruskin, Froude and Emerson. While Emerson was "a sweet-tempered Carlyle living in sunshine, Carlyle was a militant Emerson moving among thunderclouds."

Carlyle fed on the milk of modern culture was a democrat when he came out fresh from the college. His whole intellectual vision was paralysed by scepticism. At the age of about 26 he went through a spiritual crisis which was the turning point in his life. After three weeks' total sleeplessness which reminds us of the Buddha's penance under the banian tree, he passed on from Atheism to a new view of life,—from the everlasting nay to the everlasting aye—whose gospel he preached through the remainder of his life.

The essence of Carlyle's whole view of life consists in the earnestness born of the perception of the mystery of life and in a "grim fire-eyed defiance" to the shams which he felt in the society around him. Carlyle is one of those who have seen the moral and spiritual decline of Europe and have striven to stem the tide with all the life-forces at their disposal. It is to be regretted that he did not rise to that mental plane in his writings where anger melts down into universal sympathy

and compassion. Yet in his life he was kind, generous, noble and full of sympathy for fellow-men.

His teachings which have been interpreted by men in various ways, are regarded by some to be inconsistent or conflicting. But the coherence, it is well said, of a man's writings lies in his personality. Carlyle is not for a "refutation-proof compact system" but he takes the freedom of a prophet to warn, to teach, to direct to enlighten. "The comfort of meeting such men of genius" says Emerson "is that they talk sincerely "

The economic and mechanical spirit of the age, insincerity in politics, luxuriousness in life, Democracy without reverence and philanthropy without sense are attacked again and again by Carlyle. He says.—

"Will you teach me the winged flight through immensity upto the throne dark with excess of bright? I do not want cheaper cotton, swifter railways; I want what Novalis calls, God, Freedom, Immortality".

Aristotle, the versatile Greek philosopher, points out that in a State the governing power seeks either its own advantage or that of the whole State and the government is bad or good accordingly. Then again the governing power may be one or a few or many men and thus there are according to him six main kinds of Government, Monarchy and Despotism (Tyranny); Aristocracy and Oligarchy; Commonwealth and Democracy. A good government is one in which as much as possible is left to the laws and as little as possible to the will of the governor. The more ancient politics seem to have gone a step further. Laws even were to be least interfered with by men. The laws were then sanctified by religion and the sovereign power was mainly the executive authority.

Democracy in its modern sense of Representative Government, was not prevalent in the small Greek states. Democracy is defined as the form of Government in which the people rules itself either directly or through representatives. Direct Democracy becomes almost impossible except in small states. The worst democracy according to Aristotle consists of a large citizen-class having leisure for politics and the worst oligarchy is that of a small number of very rich and influential men. The essence of modern representative government is that the people does not govern itself, says an eminent authority, but periodically elects those who shall govern on its behalf. The idea of representation is opposed to "presence in person" or presentation. The English bicameral constitution combines the two principles of presentation and representation.

Carlyle seems to have come to the conclusion that democracy was wrong both in principle and in method. He had no faith in the judgment of the multitude. He says "Only by reducing to zero nine of these votes can wisdom issue out of your ten... The universe is a monarchy a hierarchy; the noble in the high places the ignoble in the low. This is in all times and in all places the Almighty Maker's law.....Democracy is the consummation of no-government and *laissez-faire*." which *laissez-faire*, it may be noted, in its turn brings down greater state-interference in the life of the individual. He had arrived before 1832, the year of the Reform Bill, to the conclusion that the ascertainment of truth and the election of the fittest did not lie with majorities. This dictum of Carlyle is corroborated by Hugh Chisolm who points out that a constituency may even be more faithfully reflected by a local peer whose only right is technically presentative. Disraeli also writing on the British Constitution expressed the fear that in getting rid of representation without election they may perchance obtain election without

representation. Representative government in fact means not so much government by the real representatives of the nation as Government in the name of the whole body of citizens through a chamber of elected deputies. It is remarkable that Mill laid a special emphasis on the need of plural voting and the argument against the ballot. He points out that "representative institutions are of little value and may be a mere instrument of tyranny or intrigue when the generality of electors are not sufficiently interested to give their vote or do not bestow their suffrages on public grounds but sell them for money or vote at the beck of some one who has control over them or whom for private reason they desire to propitiate". Popular election thus practised instead of a security against mis-government is but an additional wheel in its machinery. No representation can reflect the views of those represented as accurately as presentation by the men themselves and this fact is reflected in the growing tendency for referendums.

It has often been said that people know their interest best. For this view Carlyle has but little sympathy. It would not be proper to confound the knowledge of one's own interests with the art by which those interests can be achieved. A man knows his face, but he cannot paint his portrait unless he is an artist. The prejudice against monarchies is the result partly of the ignorance of the evils of democracy and partly of the abuse of power by some monarchs in the past.

The positive teaching of Carlyle in the art of government leans towards monarchy and definitely towards Hero-worship; and the first point in his teaching in this direction is "Obedience" which he says is the primary duty of man. The modern democratic forces are to be met with by a greater faith in the leaders—the real leaders—of men.

Carlyle had a tendency to praise might or power. He forgets to note that might or strength is but a quality common to, though varying in degree in, many men. When he says that 'might is right' we have to understand the dictum as referring sometimes to history accomplished but sometimes also to history in progress and thus what momentarily succeeds is not always the might which is right. He points out to us that might is not mere physical strength, and that the wise man is the really strong man.

The strongest government thus is the best i. e. one in which power is supreme and concentrated in a single ruler. Carlyle leans to the side of monarchy, but a king he defines as a minister or servant of the State. In the light of later events, thoughtful opinion also has inclined towards constitutional monarchy because of its continuity, efficiency, economy and accountability. Carlyle's emphasis is on men rather than on the constitutions.

Carlyle was an upholder of government *for* the people. He however believed that there are so many weaknesses to which ordinary men are liable that the government *by* the people is neither feasible nor desirable. These observations have a direct bearing on the constitution of some of our native states which do not deserve our prejudice but our approbation. True democracy is rarely to be found in our age. We have what Bagehot calls 'government by discussion'. The cry for democracy is a cry already antiquated and out of fashion even in countries like Russia supposed to be in the van of European progress.



The Basic Lines of Ancient Indian Ethics, Economics & Politics



INTRODUCTORY

*It is a privilege to address this Congress of Intellectuals from various parts of the world who are interested in Oriental Learning and Culture—a Congress which is held in the very heart of Europe from where flow the blood-veins of modern thoughts and theories—a Congress whose attitude, we take it, is one of sympathy and reverence which are necessary for the study of the human heritage of the East. The study of the basic lines of Indian Ethics, Economics and Politics has further a particular interest and utility at the present juncture of world's affairs. For, we are on the threshold of a crisis in the struggle between Democracy and Dictatorship, between Capitalism and Communism, between spiritual Faith and materialistic Disbelief. Indian ideals represent if I be allowed to say so, the quintessence of Asiatic thought and the spirit of the East, which as is well-known has sent the light of the prophets throughout the world. Those ideals, further, have been the rule and line of the Nation which has lived from the dawn of human history even upto these times and whose vitality and genius have been known to the world at

*Paper presented before the XX International Congress of Orientalists at Brussels, Sept. 1938.

large through personalities like Tagore and Gandhi, Ranjitsinh and Radhakisan. The ideals carry with them the testimony of time, the logic of longevity which is not a negligible factor in this age of the melting of Nations.

The difficulty of understanding the Indian perspective arises from the fact that the Indian System
Difficulties of is a very complex system. It is a system
the Subject as huge and complicated as the wide world which it was intended to cover and equally consistant, organic and perfected in design. If we once realize the Basic Lines, the understanding of the whole upper structure becomes not only an easy job but even a pleasure. The caste-system, the practice of Suttee, the prevailing asceticism, the Khaddar cult, the pre-puberty marriages, the injunctions for contactual purity and the innate conservatism of the people are all illumined by these basic lines. But it is still more interesting that these lines of light are very near or just parallel to those of the early heritage even of this great continent of Europe and it is so, I think, because all mankind was initially but one family.

The subject is indeed vast but I do not propose to go much further than the basic lines which
Scope of the are as it were the key—the Open Sesame to
Inquiry the whole Indian system of life and letters. I have further chosen to confine myself to the ancient period of Indian thought from which the thought currents of Modern India have been flowing, diluted, tinged or mixed, they may be, with the other thought-streams of the world to-day. My main authorities for these researches are the earliest Sacred Books of India, viz the Vedas, the Smritis, the Purānas, the Itihāsas, the Tantras and cognate Shāstric literature. I do not however propose to trouble you with technical details

and original quotations which may make my thesis more exact and erudite but less interesting.

My personal apology for retelling a subject which has been already rehearsed by so many scholars and Savants of Europe and Asia is not only that it is a subject of perennial interest, not only that it has a living utility for the world to-day but also that every mind is a new camera with its own focus, its machine, its own resting tripod and its own fresh perspective and that its photoprints may in a Symposium of Letters serve to be links for understanding the Complex Whole. As regards the method I prefer to approach the authorities from whom we draw our inferences and information with the spirit and respect of a student rather than the "Spirit Supreme" of an overlord to whom his likings-are measures of Truth. I should approach these ancient treasures less as a critic than as a reverential inquirer and when I perceive that no other more reliable data is available for sitting in adverse judgment upon them, when I observe that their language and contents are of hoary antiquity and yet of wonderful perfection and structure, when I see that the ideals of Truth, Charity, Austerity and Purity set forth therein are the solaces of our homes and hearts, when I realise with the humility of the Scientists that the world of ne-science is infinite, when I hear that the new scientific vision is bringing more and more evidence in their favour, I feel that there is some justification for this attitude of greater confidence in the reliability of those authorities I may submit a relevant instance of this method of approach. The texts expressly state that the Mahabharata-the great epic was written about five thousand years ago while the Ramayana-the other great epic was written in the Treta Age i.e. more than nine hundred thousand years ago. Now leaving aside unconvincing

though apt generalizations from language and style which are easily explainable on other theories, if we take these texts with a greater trust it would be easier to understand how in the Ramayana about nine hundred milleniums before, mankind was so very different from what we can conveniently imagine. The Purānas especially relate, ostensibly and avowedly, tales of by-gone ages—even of millions of years before and now that science is certifying that mankind must be living for millions of years, we need not be unwilling to have peeps in the past only because it seems so strange and unbelievable. We have in these sanctified books conserved the choicest material of the panorama of History. It may be derived from Yogic powers, from Nature's Radiogram or from oral tradition. We are to-day alive to the fact that the mind is a powerful machine, a wonderful receiver as well as a transmitter.

The great value of the Indian Systems of Ethics, Economics and Politics arises from the fact that they have stood the test of the great touchstones of Time, Nature and Conscience. But a greater tribute to them is that they have eminently stood the test of Reason. Firstly they have stood the test of time. The Aryans or the Hindus as they are now called are the earliest living Nation on the earth's surface keeping to its old ideals, practices and institutions right up to the present. They have stood the test of Nature. These have answered the needs of all temperaments, tribes and races which have all thriven and lived under these ancient systems. They have further stood the test of Conscience. These systems have developed the noblest conscience under them which has reflected itself in the purity of the Indian Home, the simplicity of Indian Life and the Politics of India which has evolved the new technique of Non-violent Non-co-operation.

The systems, as I said, have also stood the test of Reason. Numerous intellectuals in India have found in these systems such wonderful logicity and sweet reasonableness as have received their unqualified homage. It is well-known how deep and comprehensive are the Laws of Manu and Yajñavalkya. The Sanskrit language has been a veritable pointer to the Science of Philology. The recluse Sanyasi is worshipped and respected in India even to-day. The unsophisticated Indian woman even to-day believes in the virtues of purity and rectitude. The family life has not yet lost its sweetness, self-sacrifice and grace in many parts of India. Kings are still revered in India and looked up to as the Mabap-parents of the people and they even to-day reciprocate the sentiment with equally cordial spirit of service and sacrifice. The Indian system has thus a unique value, being the most long-lived and in tune with nature, conscience and reason. We may now pass on to consider what were the basic principles of the system which has exhibited such a wonderful tenacity in the history of the human race and has exercised such a fascination on the human mind. The devout Indians make no claim to credit for its value and regard the system as the one originally revealed by God for man and hence everlasting or *Sanātana* ever-so-good and immeasurably wonderful. Man's divine Maker gave him the light to give the initial guidance—the Major Premise to his Reason. Philosophic students are well aware that no Major Premise can be proved, except by omniscience.



THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The one thing that strikes the foreign onlooker about Indian systems is their strangeness. This strangeness or uniqueness will be found in the ultimate analysis to be due to normal basic lines recognized and respected by the generality of civilized mankind. I call them basic lines because they are practically the key-principles for their straight and easy interpretation. We find that the whole Indian System of Life is tuned upon seven principal keys. We find there (1) Insistence on Truth (2) Following of the Clues of Nature (3) Use of Symbolism (4) Sanctification of the Good (5) Keen Classification and Gradation (6) Emphasis on Purity and (7) Minuteness of Detail. I shall try to illustrate these characteristic features by a few apt or interesting instances.

The ancient Aryans seem to have developed a wonderful capacity for detaching themselves from mundane matters. The keystone to the whole arc of their system of life was their philosophy. In this the master-teachers seem to have adhered to Truth without a compromise. Their main reasoning may be thus analysed. Truth—absolute truth—is indestructible by time, space and substance. The whole panorama of the universe is destructible. It is a passing show. It is, hence, not reliably or absolutely true. All fumbling about it therefore is “roaming in the glomains” — “running after the mirage.” Berkley, the English Philosopher has a similar theory but it is left in his books. In India there are millions of men to whom the philosophical theory of the Vedanta is true and serves as the practical principle of life. It is that which saves

them from lust and greediness, from dishonesty and sin, and leads them to renounce their home to become Sanyāsins living in the recesses of the Himalayas, meditating upon the Absolute Reality. They do not conveniently assume that the sensuous world is the Real world and the only world. The perceiver is the real entity whose existence is unchallengeable, self-evident and axiomatic. The perceived whole is merged in the perceiving Soul. We find the ephemeral nature of this worldly existence emphasized in the great teachings of Buddha, Christ, Mohammed and other great prophets but the underlying philosophical position is worked up in the Philosophy of the Vedas.

The second principle we find pervading the Indian System of life is the following of the clues of Nature. For this the ancient method of Clues of Nature time-reckoning is an apt illustration. The months are counted by the lunar-calender year. They are named by the twelve constellations characterizing them: e.g. Kartik from Krittika, Pous from Pushya and so on. The month is divided into the bright half and the dark half and each date of the month is fixed by rule and line of the cosmic system. It may be of 29 days or 30 but the number is not arbitrarily fixed or conveniently put down as is proposed by our American friends who would have thirteen months of four weeks each. The Aryans use Nature as the pointer to their lives. Their most important functions of life such as marriage, investiture of Kings and laying of foundations as well as the timings of prayers and festivals follow the clues of nature. It might seem strange but the devout Hindu sits up to remember God when there is an eclipse—when the Sun, the source of light on earth seems shrouded in darkness. The eclipse to the Indian is both a physical fact and an invitation to prayer and purification. It is an instrument of symbolism.

Now coming to symbolism with which the whole Indian life is replete, I may point out that there is symbolism in sacred works, symbolism in actual worship, symbolism in ideals and symbolism in practical life. European scholars are aware of the symbolism in the worship of Shiva (lit. the good) as the Generating principle of all life. Some of us were fighting shy of the idea till the Eugenists and the Nudists attacked us with their philosophies. But the instance I am going to give you is from the homelier phase of Indian life viz.—the marriage. Numerous symbolical practices have come down to the present from the olden times. One instance will suffice. There, of course, is no period of courtship before marriage. There is husband—huntsng and bride—beseeching of course but not by the parties themselves. The lad or the lass remain the monarch of all they survey, and do not have to undergo the humiliating ordeals of false flatteries and flat denials. They are brought together apparently by their elders who are supposed to look to all things in a general perspective. I do not propose to make reflection on the merits of choice by the parties or choice by the parents; because they are often if not always intermingling circles of influence in all climes. So then, on the day of the marriage the bridegroom arrives at the Father-in-Law's house —of course in right royal procession. The veiled bride is taken to the entrance. She stoops and twitches the would-be-husband on the toe of the right leg. Of course she is a knowing child of about twelve and I should leave to our psychologists the analysis of her complex emotions. It is romance, riddle, and rythm entwined together in symbolic symphony. The usage represents a complete ideal in a nutshell. The wife is not to keep on examining her husband's credentials; she is practically to shut her eyes to the side—avenues and bow to her husband and bowing she will find her friend and guide and lord. The bridegroom also receives

an inkling of the fact that it is not all easy sailing. The girl is coming to give the twitch—perhaps the sweet bowing twitch of life. Here we have realism entwined with idealism through the instrument of symbolism.

We shall turn now to the fourth key principle viz sanctification of the good. Nowadays we are apt to think that a thing may be good but why should it be dubbed sacred or holy. Sanctity is really a seal and certificate of goodness of it by saintly sages. We say a thing is good but we find it attacked by other interests and the good is no longer good. Theories can be invented and philosophies worked out to make the worse seem the lesser evil and *vice versa*. In the highest stage of understanding nothing may be true but the Absolute. But for reaching that stage and realizing the Absolute there is the right direction and the wrong direction. Those that have faith in cosmic Truths, tentative though they may be, can be all the more in view of the lines of light by means of such sanctification. It has been so almost all over the world. Days have been sanctified, buildings have been sanctified, men have been sanctified, events like birth and death have been sanctified, institutions like marriage have been sanctified. But the process and sphere of sanctification in India have been much wider. It is understood that human life is a rare privilege of the migrating Soul. It is regarded as the door to salvation and the highest ends of existence. This life therefore is precious and the whole way unto the great end of life should therefore be sanctified. And this sanctified way is the path of Dharma or Religion in the widest sense of the term. As in the case of the individual so also for the society, Religion lays down the Ultimate Good and sanctifies it. Everything good, pure and noble was sanctified in India. "All work is sacred" says Carlyle

in his emotional outburst. It is perhaps too wide a eulogy. But to the ancient Rishi—the Seer—all good activity was sacred. In fact everything good for the individual and for the Society was sanctified. Sovereignty was sanctified by religious rites, fight for righteous cause was sanctified by the holy texts, memories of forefathers was sanctified by *Shraddha*, marriage was sanctified by religious solemnities. The sixteen Samskaras or holy initiations in a person's life begin with the beginning of life and end with its close at the funeral pyre. Not only good acts or moves or deeds were sanctified but Truth was sanctified by the canonization of the sacred works, temples were sanctified for worship and days such as the Ekadashi and Shivaratri were also sanctified for religious austerities. The unknown arrival, the pious Brahmana, the virgin maiden, the cow, the Tulshi plant were all sanctified. Even the great symbols such as the lighted lamp, the plough, the threshold received their mead of homage. To the ancient Indian the world was as it is to the unsophisticated Hindu even to-day in God and of God, in which His divinity manifested itself all round and it was to be worshipped more and more in proportion to the purity and nobility of the manifestation. This brings us to the next basic-principle viz, classification and gradation

We are aware that keen classification and gradation are a characteristic feature of the scientific attitude. It is this characteristic which evokes not a small amount of shying and sarcasm from the "Omniscient" layman. It is the same characteristic which fills the general onlooker with a sort of astonishment and the student with a sense of admiration. I may introduce the subject with a reference to Sanskrit philology. We find that in the Sanskrit language—perhaps the most ancient and enduring.

language of the world—the classification of the alphabet is wonderfully scientific. The vowels and the consonants form two separate groups. The consonants are further divided and arranged into Gutturals, Palatals, Linguals, Dentals, Labials etc., just in the order of the ocular portion which helps principally in originating the sound. The pronunciations are also perfectly phonetic and regularly following the letter symbols. We may well tarry before we charge such a straight and scientific people of injustice and prejudice in classifying even the Society into classes or castes. They regard the society as having been divinely ordained into natural classes on account of men's fundamental traits (Guna) and activities (Karma) With heredity and naturalness the sting of difference disappears. The caste comes by heredity but is lost by religious default or moral turpitude. The principal original four castes are well-known. The Brahmana—the men of righteousness, Kshatriya—the men of valour, Vaisya—the men of tillage and trade and Shoodra—the men of labour. They formed a natural hierarchy of virtue, valour, wealth and work. There was also a further gradation in life. "Every thing is fit to be dedicated to the Brāhmana" says Manu "who has received the light of knowledge" But he also points out that the Brāhmana who has an year's stock of food is superior to the one who has the store for three. He who has the store for three days is still higher and he who lives from day to day is the highest of them all. So the privilege of deserving is balanced on the other side by the duty of self-abnegation. The true Brāhmana's life is practically a Voluntary vow of poverty. In his life we find the same ideal exalted as in the Bible when we are told that it is as difficult for the man of wealth to pass through the gates of Heaven as it would be for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle. It is perhaps to remind us of that ideal that our communist comrades propose to relieve the rich of their burdens. But it was just the other way round in ancient

India. It was not by scheduling wealth as the chief object of life but by honouring those who disregarded it that the Indian Rishes made wealth the common possession of the community.

This idea of gradation brings us to the next point viz the outstanding factors in gradation. These are no doubt many but can be summed up in one word: Purity—Purity in its widest interpretation—including Physical purity, Cultural purity, Moral purity Mental purity and Spiritual purity. It was this principle of Purity that fixed up the gradations of the caste and is still the ruling principle. The Brahmanic ideal was soon singled out as above the diplomatic impurities of the warrior-class and the business chickenries of the trader and the farmer. The sex-purity was still more venerated. ‘Suttee’ really means the chaste woman. She was exalted and praised in life and she was praised even if in the height of her self-sacrifice, she followed her husband on the funeral pyre. The names of the five great suttees are amongst the morning recitals of the Hindu. But the more interesting part of it is the selection. Ahalyā the wife of Goutama was pure in mind though her body was made unclean by Indra, in the garb of Goutama. Draupadi had five husbands viz the Pāndavas; Seeta had been confined for long at the garden of Rāvana, Tārā was the mate of the monkey-man Vāli who married her dead husband’s brother and Mandodari was the wife of the Demon Rāvana who married her husband’s brother after the former’s death. These names are characteristic of the wonderful balance of mind of the Rishis who embodied the ideal of purity by cross-sections indeed but so transparently that he who runs may read it. The body of Ahalya was unclean but her mind was pure; so also Draupadi looked upon the five as one, Seetā was pure even in the garden of her would-be ravisher, Tārā was a monkey-woman

and Mandodari a demoness for whom purity even with widow-remarriage was an achievement. Reflections are cast on the lot of the Hindu widow but she is really a highly respected and felt for member of the joint Hindu family. It is only when she falls from the standard of purity expected of her that she comes in for criticism and all that follows in the wake of such a conduct. It is only the high class widows who are expected to conform to a nobler standard, that are not expected to remarry. The lower castes have a free hand that way. Purity includes also purity of birth. The ancient Hindu-Indian believed in heredity as does the modern scientist. To both birth is not an accident. It is the continuance of the species with hereditary traits, tendencies, tenacities and temperaments. It may be said that the Indians took heredity as the basis of classification and purity of life, as the basis of gradation. The castes and classes in India are as rational and natural as the classifications in Botany and have been found to be equally useful for the development and betterment of the species.

This brings us to the seventh or last principle of interpretation of the Indian System. As emancipation and ennoblement of the Individual and the species was the aim of the Indian saints and sages the Indian system has been very particular in the exactitude of details. A sage of the eminence of Manu telling us how much we should clean our mouth after the meals or that the Brahmachari shall not chew the beetle-leaf, might seem perhaps too trite or too small a detail. But wherever we want perfect results as in science or in sanitation or in society this exactitude will be found to be of the essence of the matter. We know how minute are the details of art for beauty and grace of the body, how minute are the details for the purity and grace of the mind, and we may consider no details too

minute, for the purity, grace and perfection of life in all its totality.

The great inference that we are inclined to draw from these data is that much the same principles govern the mind of man all over the world; that its fundamental leanings are much the same from the dawn of history down to our own chequered times and that these fundamentals are found to be the most enduring factors of human concern and conservation. With occasional lapses in opinion, belief and action, man has tried to abide by Truth, to follow the clues of Nature, to utilize the method of symbolism, to sanctify the good, the adorable and the true, to classify and grade, to seek greater purity and to evolve detailed means for rule and order. We find that this ancient stock of human race insisted perhaps more thoroughly on those objects and has probably therefore secured its longevity.



BASIC LINES OF ETHICS

All social sciences anticipate a philosophic basis and ethics none the less so. We have already referred to the Indian philosophical thought, regarding the Universe as an 'illusion not true in the absolute sense because it is changeable and destructible' The perceiving Soul is the unchallengeable reality. This soul is really infinite and imperishable. Its nature is Life, Vitality and Joy. It is the illusion of this world which makes it feel unhappy The mind and the intellect are its appertinances Neither the mind nor the intellect is the Soul. The Upanishad says—"This Brahma (Spirit) is perfect: this (Manifestation) is perfect. From the Perfect the Imperfect (Illusion) comes into being. From the Perfect the Perfect being taken away the Perfect remains".

The Soul being in essence perfect all *desire* is a weakness. But does it not come natural? How do you explain it? This is the great riddle; and the ancient sage's reply to it was drawn from the Vedas The spirit supreme is indeed perfect and hence nothing can disturb its tranquil joy. But this state of singleness without a variety is monotonous. It is the dales and valleys and the plateaus that bring the mountain into relief It was this consciousness, of which we often find a counterpart in our souls, which made Him say or think "I am One, May I be multifold; May I propagate" It was this basic momentum from which, say the Vedas, you may *assume*, the world came into being Now this view of the origin of the Universe implies all our experience We who are His manifestations have the same desire to find pleasure in the variety around us and the same norm for propagation That's our Nature because of the original impact that we have received. And the Upanishad says "All

this moving Universe is pervaded by the presence of the Omnipotent. Enjoy that which has been left to thee by it. Do not snatch away anybody's possession" (Ishāwāsyā. I). A straight simple life is thus a corollary from the Immanence of the spirit of which we, let us say for the time being, are the counterparts. "Attending to the right activities thou mayest desire to live" it says "for a hundred years". The natural question is : What are the right activities and why take to them at all ? The reply is "On account of thy very nature, thou shalt want to do something." So let that something be such as may lead thee to Eternal peace and union with Infinite joy. Were it not for the fact that owing to ignorance combined with natural desires we misbehave and draw upon us uneasiness, misery or darkness we would not have had to undergo any disciplinary measure at all. We have to guide ourselves against our own mischief-making tendencies and hence we need the light of guidance. This guidance is supplied by God in His Divine grace and His love unto the individual Soul by revealing unto Him the Law of Religion. Suppose, we say, the soul goes on in its natural desires and tendencies : what then. ? Well, if you go on that way here, you go on to "the regions of envy and strife and darkness". If you feel you have had enough and to spare of this world, if you feel satiated with its experiences and want a nobler, purer and happier condition, then go by the way of religion. "There is really no inherent sin" says Manu "in Flesh, Wine or Woman. Men are inclined to them naturally but it is the way of Cessation from them that achieves the great ends". Is it not a scientific, social and practical truth as well ? Truths of great moment are hidden in the sacred books of Indians by riddles to put the undeserving natures out of scent. But the great value of the Indian Sacred Books is caught by their perfect exposure of truth and all truth. They do not mince matters. They do not lay down rules with a wink in the eye. They do

not play hide and seek. My statement will readily come home to those who have studied those works in their entirety. They are indeed a vast ocean but it is an Ocean of Light. We have thus seen that the fundamental ethics of the Upanishads lead us to the Principle of the *reduction of activity* ultimately to zero: firstly because the perfect Soul has nothing worth desiring; and secondly because nothing can really satisfy that infinite Soul in this evanescent, transient and changing world. His best attitude is to witness it as a Talkie film realizing all the while that it is a play, projected from the Heaven. "This worldly existence" says the Geeta as well as the Upanishads "is a temporary unanalysable tree that has its roots high up and its branches here below; its foliage is the Chhandas—the Vedas".

All morality therefore is essentially negative. It restricts

<p>Morality in Essence Nega- tive</p>	<p>you, stops you or dissuades you from certain acts that may lead you down deeper into the quagmire. Even the Golden Rule of the Indian Gospel as also of the Christian Gospel has a fundamentally negative use i.e.</p>
--	---

Do *not* do unto others as you would not be done by. The positive expression is rather to remind us of the negative need. Let us take another instance. Injunctions of marriage serve a double purpose. They implement the Natural craving or desire; because it would be impracticable to deny it. But at the same time they limit its scope. I have been often wondering whether our Communist friends have realized the shrewd insight of our great forefathers who instituted the Institution of Marriage to eke out maximum happiness from an animal normality, which seeks promiscuous relationship. It is the limitation and all the self-discipline it implies, it is the sense of mutual fidelity until death, it is the purity of love flowing from religious duty, it is the privilege of *mine-ness* if I may coin the word, that ennobles

this animal normality into the pleasure of life and the solace of death beyond the dream of promiscuous connections. We must concede that there are *failures* in marriage as there are failures in all examinations but they will ultimately be found to be due to the want of proper work over the *text*.

The great moral injunction for non-hurt to all living creatures which is often positively interpreted as charity or pity is also of the same character, dissuading us from hurting other souls who are our counterparts or more correctly, our reflections. **Non-hurt to Living Beings** Talk of peace and goodwill would be merely diplomacy towards ends of self-interest without the realization of the immanence of God in the whole of the Universe; and this immanence and continuity of the Soul is realized in nothing more than the satisfaction we find for ourselves in the satisfaction of others and the inner uneasiness we feel in making others uneasy. Flesh diet is also to be avoided, for it implies a war on birds and beasts.

Purity is another of the four great pillars of morality viz Truth, Charity, Austerity and Purity which **All-sided Purity of Life** we have already referred to. We need further remark that there is a gradation in purity as there is a gradation in all qualities. There are degrees, positive, comparative and superlative—good better and best even there. This purity also is analysable ultimately into a negative implication—cessation from bad contact. In fact Shree Krishna in the *Bhagavad Geeta* lays down that *contact* itself is the source of mischief and ultimate deliverance from it is desirable. For, the contact brings in the desire, the desire creates the passions and passions put the soul out of balance and out of peace.

The basic line of morals that we have here presented is not the line of inaction; for, the genius of the
Not a Line of Inaction of ancients could envisage its unnaturalness and impracticability. It is the line of *less* action. And even at this height of our activities do we not want such a teaching? We say, reduce armaments, reduce taxes, reduce wars, reduce government interference. We are also asked to reduce over production and hours of labour and to reduce births as well as deaths. Reduction is the cry all round. From another point of view, all life is an expenditure of energy and conservation of energy means conservation of life.

As a natural deduction of such a negative theory of morals we find that the method of contraries is
The Method of Contraries or Method of Drops extensively used in the Hindu ethical injunctions. When the foundation for the young boy's mentality is to be laid in his years of education he is enjoined to forego absolutely the company of woman. When the mind is formed he is asked—enjoined to go home and marry. Then further on after he has continued the line of his ancestors and grown old he is enjoined to renounce his home and family. We find this Method of Drop as one proceeds is usually occurring in the sacred injunctions of the Hindus. The Kshatriya—warrior, for instance, is enjoined to fight valiantly in war, the Brahmana is normally enjoined not to use weapons or fight in the battle at all. We find that the sage Vishwāmitra who could smash the Rākshasas or demons in a moment did not do it himself. He called in the aid of Rama the Kshatriya Warrior to do the work for him. This differentiation added to the traits of heredity, brought about the permanence of character and characteristics for which India is not only notable but has been a veritable laboratory and museum of millenniums of social, psychic and hereditary experiments.

This brings us to the other great and important principle in Indian ethics viz. propriety of prescription. **Propriety of Prescription by Groups** The Indian sages never lost sight of the fact that men are unequal on almost all counts; unequal in their natural as well as acquired qualities, abilities and propensities. When this is realized a few rules of morals for all become too much like copy-book morality, and are soon left out of count. From the Indian point of view every man is on a different scale of moral ladder, and moral progress is a science and an art which is as extensive, deep and intricate as the minds with which it is concerned. The caste-system of grouping is therefore consolidated on religio-moral standards to concentrate similar strata and achieve best results by mutual contacts and co-operation. Thus we have a variety in moral injunctions though a unity in principle.

The ethical position that we have taken up may be further elucidated by an illustration. Let us imagine **The Theological Aspect** a vast circle of activity that the Universe practically is. The centre is God or Supreme Being. The human monads are moving in that circle. There are centripetal forces and centrifugal forces; the former take the monad towards the centre, the latter take it away from the centre. There are other rotatory forces which make him rotate in the same circumference. These are neutral forces of the world. Those forces that take man towards the centre are ethically desirable forces. Those of the opposite kind are undesirable forces. This is a very convenient line of settling which is which by one's own self. But it posits the supreme Spirit which is a difficult pill to swallow for people who are trained to be godless. The same forces may be otherwise stated as forces of conservation and forces of dissipation. Man is almost midway. He is an organism ordinarily dissipating itself. Culture,

towards the great object of his life. So the Rishis of old laid down a general dictum of control of all activities. "Control thy speech" says the sacred Purana "control thy mind, control thy breath, control thy senses, control thyself by thy self, and thou shalt not be booked again for the journey of birth and death" (Bhāgwatam). This means a purer life whose great instrument is austerity. "Austerity" says Manu "is the beginning, it is the middle, it is the end". It is the highest law of progressive life. It is the quality of self-denial and remains one of the noblest virtues even to-day. Lenin gave up the luxuries of the table, the British King gave up the splendour of Sovereignty and the Feurer has forgone the joys of family life.

This brings us to another point about morals viz are there any fundamental morals or morality is only relative. That it is relative in a sense we have already noted. But if we go deeper in the problem it reduces itself to the question "Who can set the moral standard". The Indian view in this matter is that man's intellect, knowledge and materials are entirely limited and he is liable to err. The Omniscient only therefore can lay down the moral truths and moral standards. Religion alone therefore is the source and determinant of moral values. They cannot and do not depend upon oscillating human opinion. Otherwise they stand self-condemned. A direct corollary from this position is that social planning which involves moral values cannot be properly done by a secular state. The social planning is done by religion. No other morality, no other planning is reliable in the Indian view of life. What religion or revelation to believe in, is a matter of man's own concern. It may be by mere faith or by reasoned conviction but that is the guide par excellence. Morality may not be absolute but it must be reliable and its reliability springs from its revealed character.

The ancient Aryans laid special stress, like the modern scientists, on insulation and purity in the **Scruples about matter of diet and drinks and contacts as Foods, Drinks, well as in the relations of the sexes. They & Contacts** have been very particular in these matters, because their maxims were - "As is the Food so is the Intellect", "As is the Seed so is the Fruit". The foods and drinks, apart from their qualities, partook, according to them, of the influences of those with whom they came into contact. We are not sure whether they anticipated the germ-theory but they were perhaps alive to the psychic effects of physical contacts. The basic line they followed for the purity of sex was peculiar and effective. Man was dealt with in a natural way by the *Rishis* of India. They realized that man was man after all. He had his hunger and thirst, physical as well as social, sexual as well as spiritual. He could not be denied his longings *in toto*. He was to *reduce* them; that was one thing. He was to *direct* them in healthy channels; that was another. But they also knew the dangers and pitfalls of keeping him hungry for long and tantalizing him. This is the key to the custom of pre-puberty marriage in India, which has come in for a good deal of trenchant criticism. It also accounts for the allowance made for polygamy amongst the princely classes and in certain cases. The ideal of purity is shown in its excelsis in the anecdote of Parashurāma—an incarnation of Vishnu slaying his dear mother Renukā at the bidding of his father, sage Jamadagni, for having lustfully eyed a prince, and in the historical incident of princess Padmini embracing the funeral pyre at the signal of the death of the brave Rajputs who were fighting to protect her from the Moslem invaders. This intense feeling for purity was reflected in all walks of life. In fact, we find the same "natural dislike of material defilement elevated into a religious sentiment" in ancient Indian faith as in Judaism. The result of this strong attitude for mental and physical purity has been abundantly clear in the social experiment of Indian life.

THE BASIC LINES OF ECONOMICS

Idea of Economics

The word 'Economics' reminds one of a shrewd cynic who has described language as 'the instrument of hiding thoughts'. In its ordinary import 'Economics' should mean the art or science of 'economy' which means again the frugal use of resources for widest results or utilities. But Economics instead of being a science for economy has become the science dealing with the production and cummulation of wealth. Of course the conservation of wealth is an idea which seems like other conservative notions to have been tabooed for all practical purposes. The ancient Indians had no such science as modern economics which has shown during a couple of hundreds of years a wonderful capacity to increase artificial money, national debts, labour disorders and general discontent. The 'Artha Shashtra' of India had a wider connotation. It referred to that *Object of Life* which provides for the common needs. On the individual side it included the Art of self-preservation and on the social side it meant the Art of governance and protection of groups i.e. Politics. The ancient Indians do not seem to have disregarded or slighted wealth in social polity as well as individual concerns. What they seem to have done is that they put down material wealth on a very low scale in life putting as they did, Virtue and Valour above Wealth. They could have said with Shakespeare "Who steals my purse steals trash" They refrained from giving artificial stimulus to the accumulation of wealth by legislation. Wealth they knew, would accumulate even without it and they provided rather for its distribution. The great instruments of distribution were Yajnas or Sacrifices in the case of Princes, building of temples, inns and wells in the case of magnates and Caste-dinners in the case of the middle classes.

Reactions of the Ideals of Life

But the greatest economic values were achieved by the upholding of the ideal of Renunciation. The Sanyasi or ascetic held the most honourable and adorable rank in public life. Kings and Princes bowed unto him. The learned Brahmana was careless of wealth. Kings were honoured and eulogized for their liberality. Even so late as the last century, instances of princes like Shree Vibha Jam of Nawanagar who gave away anything and everything to the needy were not uncommon. "Nothing is really yours. Wealth is fleeting. What you give, you have gained." That was the philosophy. This general attitude towards wealth was infused by the general attitude towards Life to which we have referred before. For the great ends of life wealth was rather a hinderance than help. But all the same wealth was not disregarded. It was greed of wealth that was set up as a weakness. Honesty in the trade and business was extolled. Out of the four aims of Life viz (1) Dharma or Righteousness, (2) Artha or Means of Life, (3) Kama or Desires and (4) Moksha or Salvation the second was not to run counter to the first and the third was not to run counter to the last. "I am the *Desire*" says Lord Shree Krishna "that is not opposed to Dharma" There is the story of Tulādhār in the Mahābhārata which sets down honesty in trade (which is described as a 'mixture of truth and falsehood') as a virtue higher than physical purity and austerity. It was true, no doubt, that wealth was a possible and convenient play-ground for vice. But as the ancient Rishis of India accepted the *self-control philosophy of life*, they were hardly led into the scramble for wealth for luxuries, much less into abnormal ways for amassing fortunes.

Economic Dicta

The same ideal which worked in morals worked in economics also. "Simplify, Reduce, Donate, Abnegate" that was the spirit

pervading all public life. Necessities of life were not to be increased and they were no index of civilization. It was realized that higher standards of life meant a greater burden of life, which in its turn meant a greater waste of energy. It would ultimately mean a keener struggle for existence and greater public discontent. There were to be not only few necessities of life but they were to be provided for, by obnoxious methods in general. Thus great *Chakras* or big machinery was taboo. Mann expressly forbids their use. The necessities of life were kept at the lowest possible level of cheapness. Hence labour also was cheap. Only a century hence, the labourer's daily wages were about two pence per day. The Sovereign could take no more than one sixth of the produce from the agriculturist. And thus the income became naturally the boundary line of state expenditure. Taxes were almost unknown. All these things tended to make life easy. They made for a more general and generous distribution of wealth. Religion and social festivals also provided for liberal donations to the poor.

Economics in Relation to Politics

Money or wealth was not the basis of the Constitution, there being no democratic or parliamentary government and therefore no franchise on a monetary basis. The various vocations had come to be stabilized and concentrated in particular groups, which formed themselves usually into castes interdining and inter-marrying within their own group. The industries therefore had no tendency to expand by competition and wealth-hankering, and they came to be confined more or less to the respective castes. This state of things has come down even to our own times. Even now the potters, the goldsmiths, the blacksmiths, the dyers, the barbers, and the washermen form different castes by themselves in many parts of India. As on the one hand there was no growth there was on the other no trouble of

competition, no risk of over-production. The burning or sinking of tons of coffee on economic grounds was an undreamt of phenomenon. These castes may be said to resemble the modern trade-corporations, with the difference that those were hereditary. The wealth came to be thus distributed through the family, the caste and the state. Undue desire for high profits or wealth was regarded as illegitimate, because wealth was regarded and allowed or encouraged only as a means to normal life not as a means to dissipation.

The Family Home

Another basic principle of Indian economy was *self-sufficiency*. The state, the town, the village was to be self-sufficient. It did not covet the neighbour's wealth but it was well-organized to produce and keep up its own. Even the private home shared this wholesome tendency. It had its own terrace, its own well or pond, its own cow-shed and a little court-yard for vegetation. Family was the smallest social unit and it consisted not only of 'He, She and children', but of parents, brothers and usually even cousins, aunts and other still more distant relatives who were unable to support themselves. It was a great experiment in religious socialism, and it has succeeded in India; for, it is a living thing even to-day. It is, no doubt, based, worked and kept up by the same forces of self-control, discipline, charity, self-abnegation and spirit of brotherly service, mutual affection and co-operation. The head of the family is respected and is the family representative at the caste meetings. The earning members of the family put their earnings in the joint stock from which is maintained the whole family. Thus the joint family formed by itself a castle of protection, a school of discipline and a little kingdom with unity of culture, unity of board and unity of interest.

Riches for Life's Needs

Wealth, we have already noted, was not condemned in itself. Laxmi, the great Goddess of female Trinity, is the goddess of wealth. It was cupidity that men were called upon to renounce. The basic material of strife is lust and cupidity and it was the dismantling of the ideal of 'wealth and woman' as a *Summum Bonum* that made for the peace, purity and benevolence in the Hindu society. Nor was greater production and exploitation of wealth to be the aim of the State. Cupidity was not the less harmful by being enthroned in government or sovereignty. Wealth was, in the normal scheme of Life, for its necessities, not for its luxuries, much less for its degradation and strife. In economics too, the same principle of simplify, reduce, abnegate, was the inspiring force. It eliminated excessive competition on the one hand and intensive production on the other. Artificial aids of tariff-legislation, elaborate machinery and control of labour became out of place. The gospel of abstinence and self-dependence was so true and forceful that it infected or shall we say, evangelized the whole human race and became under the inspiration of Prophets and Saints, the rule and line of the world. We need hardly mention that within a short period of the last two or three hundred years we have been able to see the risks and dangers of the rule and line of the alternative route.



THE BASIC LINES OF POLITICS

The Origin of the State

The origin of the state in a consolidated form was, according to the Indian theory also, posterior to the origin of society. The existence of the State as an embodiment of power to rule and to protect, pre-supposes the existence of strife due to conflicts of ideals, interests and passions. In the earlier stages man being like the child innocent, straightforward and unsophisticated, he hardly needed the coercion of the State. Family was the natural unit and the family-head was naturally the friend, guide, and philosopher of the family. But in course of time, with the multiplication of the race and the development of conflicting passions and cupidity, mutual attacks and robberies made the state necessary. The king was thus brought into existence for the protection of the people by the divine will. This kingship was hereditary and the king was enjoined to protect the people in their own respective parts of duty.

The Institution of Monarchy

The hereditary nature of kingship was highly serviceable not only for continuing the traits of heredity but also for the training of the king. The king was to be enlightened in the Vedas or knowledge Divine, and he was to protect the people in accordance with justice. In the monarchic system we again perceive the same tendency of the Aryan mind to follow the clues of nature. The universe is a monarchy. The very basis of science is the uniformity of its legislation, behind which is the Unity of the Governing Power. That governing power is divine and the same divine power was the source of laws which man was to obey. The divinely inspired Manu, an incarnation or manifestation of God, was therefore their great constitution-

maker and law-giver. The people's interests were to be supreme and the people were to be ruled in accordance with, as Manu says, their respective religious duties. Religion was in fact the law of the uplift of life and it was the end for which the state was the means. The king being thus the highest constitutional power to validate and protect the greatest interest of life, he was sanctified by religion. The Brāhamana gave him everyday, at dinner-time, his personal tribute by a symbolic religious rite.

Theocratic Constitutional Monarchy

The principle functions of the sovereign were executive and judicial. The divine law was the basic law. The Royal Staff which was the symbol of Rule, was also the symbol of Protection. The future of man and the state was not left at the mercy of men's changing likes, lights, lures, licenses and judgements. They were not to be made politically-minded but they were to be made religiously-minded. They were not involved as active agents in the state. They were not involved in the government and therefore the responsibility for wars was not on them. On the other hand the king was expected to meet his ministers and subjects in the Durbar and to hear what they had to say from time to time. The king's powers were limited also in another way. He was to be guided not only by the ministers but also by a saintly adviser of experience like Vasishtha, who was in the position of an elder or preceptor to the king. He advised him on great matters of the state and his advice was to be followed by the king. This preceptor or Guru had no constitutional powers but his saintly and disinterested advice could be neglected by the king only at his peril. There are examples of king Vena and others who came to grief and death for acting in a head-long manner in defiance of religion, or morality. "The royal staff can be held by him who is pure, truthful, faithful to the Shastras, well-supported and talented"

says the divine law-giver Manu. The cardinal object of the creation of the king has been thus described—

“The king had been created as the all-round protector of all the people following their own religion or duties of their classes and stages in due order” Manu 7-35.

There are details of “don’ts” for the king and details for ministries and their functions. It was the spirit of piety and righteousness that was fundamentally required of the king. He was expected to be possessed of very good manners and insolence in a king was considered a great weakness. The ancient great Indian princes like Harishchandra, Rama, Janaka, and Yudhisthira scrupulously followed the great ideal. Shivaji the founder of the Maratha empire and Pratap the Rana, of Udayapur, in modern times and princes of some the native states even to-day have been striving to approach the ideal. They have parental affection towards their subjects and saintly devotion towards their religion. They treat all religions with respect realizing therein the security, hope, and order of the human race

Learning as the Dominant Principle

The details of the government need not detain us. We shall pass on to the other great basic lines which differentiated and hall-marked the ancient Indian Polity. Next to the signalization and sanctification of Theocratic Constitutional Monarchy we have the principle of culture and learning prevailing in the state. According to Manu even one excellent Brāhmana, learned in the Vedas is sufficient to interpret the Dharma or standards of righteousness, but not even thousands of those who are ignorant of the same. A learned Brahmana is further said to be one who not only knows the Shastras but can interpret them in line with Reason. Every thinker knows that we have to find our fundamental premises from a super-rational or extra-rational

source, and this source was Revelation in the ancient Indian polity. This position puts democracy out of count. It puts the notion of Equality still more out of count. Men were unequal in their intellectual and moral judgements as well as in their physical, mental and spiritual capacities. The value of one vote was not equal to that of the other. To value the votes or opinions equally was the way to mis-guidance and could result in all the mischief of wrong scales and wrong weights. Further, as a corollary, this view discounts the rule of majority and the rule of the ballot-box which besides being wrongly weighted might mean the tyranny of a strong-minded majority over a big minority, and even civil war in the last extreme. People under the Indian system are to be governed neither by majority nor by dictatorial minorities. They are to be governed by the stable constitution which goes by the rule and line of the respective religion which they themselves have *voluntarily* chosen to follow.

War and Conquests

The ancient Indian sages seem to have neither interdicted conquest nor commended war. They were neither pacifists nor militarists either by convenience or by principle. They met the needs of human ambitions in quite a wonderful way. It was the way of royal sacrifices as the Rājasooya or Ashwamedha. But these were not mere sacrifices. They were challenges of a covert nature to the princes and kings round about. The ambitious prince or king was, in an Ashwamedha sacrifice to set free a horse to roam about, with the army following it all through. The countries where it roamed were either to exhibit friendly relations with the great Potentate or submit to him or to tie up the horse and challenge a battle. The horse was in fact the emblem of the monarch's sovereignty. Thus they provided not only for the ambition of a powerful potentate but also for the

recognition and spread of an integral culture. Thus the great ideal of the state as an instrument for the spread of righteousness was kept up. Even the battles that took place had to observe strict rules of equity, the horseman fighting with horseman and the foot-soldier with foot-soldier. It was as great a disgrace to act unrighteously on the field of battle as to fly away from it. Women were not to take part in warfare, the Brāhmanas neither, nor usually the Vaishyas. Proscription was impossible on the very ground of religion which was sacred even to the State. A system akin to the feudal system was evolved and it supplied the king with his armies. Armies could be mobilized but wars were not so bitter, prolonged and inequitable as in our own times. The religious atmosphere of those ages valued more the peace of soul than the possessions of the earth. The values are perhaps true even to-day but they were brought home to the people then by their men of light and leading.

Character of the State

The ancient ideal of the Indian state presents various features of the modern state in a unique combination. It was a totalitarian state as opposed to a parliamentary democracy; but its basis was not the will of the dictator but the law of religion. It had the essence of democracy, in the sense that it was for the people's good and according to the tacit consent of the people who by accepting a religion had by implication accepted its scheme of life. It was constitutional limited monarchy as opposed to absolute monarchy or dictatorship, either of a leader or of the proletariat. It was constitutionally bound up and limited by religious texts, ministerial cabinets, and guardian Rishis. In its basis it was a theocracy while in its working it was a monarchy. In actual practice it came to be an aristocracy of virtue and talents. The kingship being hereditary it may be contrasted in its advantage of preliminary education and training

to the king, with the hap-hazard mentality and ideas of a Dictator or President sitting over the destinies of a people. In reality, the ancient system may be said to be the noblest form of democracy, being government by the noblest and best of the people and according to the creed of the people's own hearts. That it continued in India for thousands of years and is continuing partly in some states of India even to-day is a tribute to its worth and value. The unique fusion of those valued elements, made for its popularity as well as longevity and stability. Under the ancient ideal, the State is the expression of Divinity, *for* the evolution of Divinity, *by* the law of Divinity. It was understood to be concerned with interests and lives too sacred and too valuable to be disposed of by the fleeting passions prejudices and whims of majorities, minorities or mixtures. We see in the ancient idea of the State, the rule of law instead of the cry for liberty, the recognition of Hierarchy of good, medium and evil instead of the push for Equality, we find the practical ideal of the family and castes instead of the theoretical cry of Fraternity, and the institution of benevolent hereditary monarchy instead of an ever-exploiting ever-changing democracy. There is one fundamental difference in the visions of the ancients and the moderns which made for a complete difference in the outlook of life. The good and the evil were not uncertain and problematic, neither undetermined nor undeterminable to the ancient Indian sages. The easiest way of heading to a chaos or a Babel of Misunderstandings is the rejection of the truths and teachings derived from Divinity. The decision of the ancients on the issue of liberty was clear. Liberty ? Yes, full liberty to go the right way, no liberty to go the wrong way. Democracy in the sense of the rule of the people by a majority of members elected by the ballot-box was fundamentally erroneous, founded as it was, on the falsehood of equality, and giving power as it did to the majority which would be easily amenable to looser inclinations,

(either its own or of its constituency) and quite likely to turn its back to minority or minorities. The problem whether one man can represent another, nay, can even represent a host of others with different opinions and inclinations was a fundamental one, which the ancient system was not forced to meet. Even, as we say that the people will be certainly guided by the best counsellors amongst them we really throw the modern democratic principle overboard. But it is not for us to enter into the merits of the various systems. Suffice it to say that the ancient system of politics was in tune with Nature and in tune with the Infinite. It has proved itself to be perennial and popular. It has been found by experience to be stable and civilizing.

Summary of the Basic Lines of Indian Systems

We have thus reviewed the basic principles of ancient Indian Ethics, Economics, and Politics. A unity and harmony of design pervades through them all. They breathe the spirit of Religion, diluted perhaps a little into general righteousness and common good-will. They raise neither nightmares nor run after will-o'-the-wisp of imagination. They are full of comfort and hope for man. They have given him satisfaction of the normal degree available unto the straightforward man with a straightforward life. They are imbued with a common spirit of Righteousness, Truth, Charity, Austerity and Purity. Even the king was expected to and he did, like Yudhishtira and numerous other potentates, relinquish his throne to practise the higher life of self-abnegation in the hills and the forests. Even the wife was bidden good-bye by the noble Brāhmanas like Yajnavalkya for the holier and fuller life of the universal *Sanyasa* and social *summum bonum*. Fame, which Aristotle put down from a different standpoint as a gift in other people's hands, was regarded good enough for the ruler and the warrior but below the aspiration of the Brāhmana who was expressly enjoined by the Shastras to beware of it as of a Snake. The Rishis' message of Philosophy inspired the whole vision of life. "There is but one *Brahman* without a second: there is nothing else." "That Brahman is Knowledge absolute." "That thou art, Oh Shwetketu." That was the essence of their message, and it elbowed out the passions and prejudices of worldliness at a stroke. Their message is testified by the

experience of various sages and saints of the human race. It is remarkable that the whole vision of the ancients was illumined by a living faith in God, His Revelations and His Dispensations. There are numerous men in the wide world even in our own times who are fired by that faith; but it has ceased to be universal.

It is the difficulty of managing things and human affairs without God (who is the Reality of Realities and the only Reality amongst Illusions,) that seems to have made our tasks more hopeless. We can build dreadnoughts of the sea and dreadnoughts of the air but we need more the Dreadnoughts of Life and for them we shall have to look up to the East, where, to borrow Prof. Sidgwick's phrase 'religion claimed to rule the whole man.' The Indians were essentially philosophers in the sense of Plato i. e. those who were able to grasp the eternal and the immutable. They had like Christians "a conception of morality as the positive law of a theocratic community possessing a written code imposed by divine Revelation". Like the Cynics of old they put "wisdom not in the skilful pursuit but in the rational disregard of pleasure." Like the Stoics they emphasized "the positive virtues of the sage." Like the Epicureans they were for withdrawing from the political conflicts to simple living and serene leisure. To them the universe was as to Saint Augustine "a spiritual kingdom, —a city of God." There was an organic unity in their whole system, because it emanated from one master-mind which revealed itself in their sacred books or the Shāstras.


Their Claim to Respect

That these systems had seeds in them which have germinated in so many directions in our world is but a tribute to their validity. It is possible to regard them as antiquated and effete.

But the great fact stands that they have stood the test of time and served the people for peace and amelioration, through long vistas of centuries. They have preserved the Hindu nation through ages and invasions, and given it the solace of life and the solace of death. In these days we have been experimenting with life-planning for the last few years and the results, I think, incline us to turn for a better and kindly light which, to quote Wordsworth, is "behind us". It may be there is nothing new in it. But the eternal verities were never new. They have been the ancient possessions of the human heart and mankind at large. They are the foundations of the boasted heritages and cultures of the elite of the human race. And I have no hesitation in believing that in the broad daylight of experience and reason they will come out all the more in their shining glory and surpassing colours.

We may in conclusion take a cursory survey of the Basic Lines of the Indian Ethical, Economic and Political systems. These systems are theo-central in that they receive their fundamentals from Divine Revelation, as opposed to fallible human speculation. The Revelation upon which they depend has come down from hoary antiquity. All the systems rest upon a philosophy which looks to the absolute reality for its object rather than to the shows of sense. They contemplate an ordered Community essentially distinct from the State. There is a hierarchy in nature and there is moral gradation in human beings. There is the great law of Karma pervading the whole Universe which rules the life of the soul from birth to birth. The passing shows of sense are but man's transient concerns and beauty an ephemeral phase of the shows of sense. Salvation being the real ultimate concern of the Soul all morality is essentially negative—a system to relieve man from the usually unavoidable ties and miseries of worldly existences. Man was not born

free and the trio of Righteousness, Devotion and Knowledge is the only pathway to real Freedom of the Soul. There being no rational ground for knocking one's brains against an ever-elusive, ever-strange and ever-unmanageable world, man must live like a sojourner in this world. Simplicity and easy-living should therefore be the keynote of his economics, and absolute renunciation the economic creed of the highest social order. The State is the means or makeshift to the Ends connoted by spiritual values. The State is not for planning the community but for preserving the divinely-planned community. Monarchy is embedded in the very nature of men and universe and the highest monarchy is the theo-central state with the divine laws propounded in the Revelation. Revelation partaking as it does of the Nature of its Divine Origin is unfathomable and ought to be man's source of inspiration and guidance. It is the test of his understanding rather than the prisoner at the bar of his Lilliputian intelligence. Man's soul is as infinite as the Universe and its fundamental guidance can come only from a source as infinite as the Unity round which the universe turns, in twilights and in shadows, in darkness and in illuminations. "What is the ultimate meaning of the Universe?" was the basic query of Lotze and the Light of Divinity has answered this quest of the infant-mind as verily it supplies the mother's milk to the infant-body. "It is a play - *Leela*, of the Pulsating Joyous Soul." say the Shastras. "What rot" says the Heretic "This world of miseries a play!" And Shakespeare answers "Yes, this world's a stage and man and women merely players." Or shall we call up the modern progress for a metaphor and say, "This world is a Talkie-House with a Supreme Director who is beyond our Sanctions but within the reach of our Love"?



Democracy a Camouflage

"Democracy, as we know it, is a fraud" says Bernard Shaw and Robert Lynd answers "Everything on earth is a fraud, if by fraud we merely mean imperfect." But Shaw is too shrewd to confound fraud with imperfection and the answer does not work. The problem, however, is not one for sleights of arguments. It is the living problem of the world to-day. Democracy as we know it, is not very old. Rating the cry for "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" of the French Revolution as its beginning, the modern democracy may be said to be hardly a hundred and fifty years old. The hyroglyphics of Nature have written out the result in bold characters and the decyphering is not very difficult.

That there are dictatorships in Italy, Germany, Russia, Turkey and other countries is not a mere accident. It is not that people have taken a fancy to dictatorships nowadays. It is not for the pleasure of a change that governments are changing hands. The fact is that democracy has been tried for these so many years and it has been found to be hollow. It has proved to be a camouflage for exploiting the people.

Even when we say that democracy will find out or bring out the right men to govern, we throw the principle underlying democracy overboard. What is democracy? Democracy, we are told, is the rule of the people, for the people, by the people. The first part viz 'of the people' is obvious for any sort of rule. The second is not and was never denied by any sane theory of government. The trouble, is with the tail—the third part viz, 'by the people.' If all men are equal why pine or plead for the 'right men'? And who are the right men? Is it that those who come out are to be dubbed as the right men, whether

they be a Marat or a Mirabeau, a Napoleon or a Nelson, a Hitler or a Lenin, a Stalin or a Mussolini ?

I am inclined to think that the mechanical genius of Aristotle made a fundamentally misleading division of governments on the basis of numbers. No government was really ruled by one man and none was ever ruled by all people. The division of governments into Monarchy, Oligarchy and Democracy which can all be good, bad, or indifferent is logical and exclusive enough but where our attention should have been rivetted to the quality it puts quantity in the forefront, and thus tends to make the quantity—the number, in government—the apple of discord. For good government the governors must be good—whether one, more or many. Unfortunately for this human world all cannot be good; many are not good; the good are few and far between. The basis of that System, therefore, is wrong which assumes, assigns or affirms the highest power to quantity which in the very nature of human affairs is more likely to go wrong; and so it has turned out to be. The democracies that go in as such, are usually partially or nominally so. But the relevant argument is that even there the tendency has been bad enough. We see that the peoples can be and are worked up to contradictory opinions and frenzies. The dictators can get almost cent. per cent. votes by proper management of the plebiscite, and better men can and do fail in elections. There are not mal-practices and intimidations *only* in dictatorships. They are in the nature of things bound to be where many men are to be managers and when many are to be managed. Bossing may be done with art or artifice or temptation, or without them. All men are not equal in their mental and moral calibre and they have to be managed in their own way.

Certainly, we do not mean to suggest that democracy can never do well; we only imply that it can do so only in proportion

to the number of good people, if and when they get into the saddle. In small states it may work well, because democracy there practically turns into an aristocracy of talents, or culture or religious virtues. But vote-catching in a big country is such a complicated affair that a would-be politician, before he dons his robes, has to enter into compromises with scruples and morals and sometimes principles as well. Usually he tries to persuade himself that the convenient thing is the right thing and carries on. This introduces a fundamentally deteriorating tendency in the State. The successful man is usually the cleverer man but not always the better man or the right man. He has usually to be a moneyed man, and he has to be thick-skinned. The saints and the sages have to be usually out of the turmoil of the election. They choose to do so or are soon elbowed out. Usually it is not their fault. Politics is a game of cunning.

Let us now look at the question from another angle of vision. Let us suppose, we managed to have the plebiscite of all the people, in any country such as England, France, United States or India. Would the people vote for the present taxes and the present economic burdens? Would they vote for such high salaries and such costly establishments and such complicated laws? 'No' will be the answer. Even on Liberty of Speech, who can say what would be the result of a plebiscite? And would the plebiscite even be for a war? And yet ostensibly democratic countries have high taxes, censorship and astounding armaments. Democracies so called are not ruled as the people would, if they were not bound down hand and foot by the clever artifice of representative government. In such a complex system as the State implies, one man cannot represent another; much less can he represent a multitude of them. He really represents only himself. The people select him only in the hope of furthering their interests. These however are jeopardized or eliminated or

misinterpreted in the vaguaries, chances, contingencies and shifting balances of parliamentary parties and voting. The Parliament decides, as it may, under the shifting forces and we persuade ourselves that *we* do it and that it is good. That which is done is tom-tommed for the time being.

Or sometimes people think the decision to be wrong or unbearable. But what is the remedy? The minority has to go to the wall unless it pleases the majority to heed it. The more so when the majority, or the government in power is a doctrinaire government or a forceful majority. We usually say, this, that and the other thing should be respected in a democracy. But that is only a compromise with the democratic principle. In practice also democracies have often turned down religions and cultural rights of minorities and so called representative governments have tyrannized over unorganized or disorganized majorities. The tyranny of the majority becomes all the more exasperating when the state becomes merely secular, or totalitarian *and* godless. For, then there are no fundamental principles to serve as guiding stars, and the state has no ideal except the opinion of the powers that be. The state instead of becoming a means to a moral end or a spiritual ideal determines its own goal and means from time to time by the ballot-box or as it suits it. Trial marriages may be a trifle to it, expropriation a mere matter of legislative enactment, and dispensation of justice an artistic manipulation of facts and evidence to state-ends and state-dogmas. Treason would be a common crime and the inculcation of the noblest beliefs may be suppressed by law. The very democratic principle is based on the implied disbelief in any superhuman dispensations whatsoever, and it falls back upon the opinion of the majority to guide and govern the state. Thus it happens that the secular democratic state without any pivotal principles tends to become erratic, progressively loose in morals, and a danger to the cultural life of the human race. Faith in principles and values is at a

discount in democracy, because the ballot-box's is a non-rational, not to say non-moral dispensation. Indeed, indifferentism in principles, one's own and those of others has been the great saviour of democracies. Otherwise they would have transformed all countries like Russia and made concentration camps, industrial sabbotages, managed trials, and shootings and purges the order of the day. I should not be surprised if in these days one may say in the vein of the Pilate "What are Principles?" and would not wait for the reply.

I should not call democracy a fraud because it is half a fraud and half self-deception. For, do we not know it as a matter of incontrovertible fact that all men are *not* equal and that the value of each vote is not therefore the same? And yet we make ourselves believe that all men *are* equal. If they are not equal why build on a basic falsehood? Can we not ransack language for a better formula than this falsehood on which to base our benevolence and good-will? We are told that all are equal in the eyes of God. I think that if God be such a bad judge as to regard the sinners and the saints and the indifferents as equal, the Communist would not be far wrong in denying Him, for He would cease to be just. Nor is the political fiction of equality true in human government. So also, the courts of justice, in fact, make it their business to find out the right and the wrong. They work through their elaborate machinery to spot the inequality and decide who is guilty and who not, who more and who less. In fact the elective machinery is but an artifice to find out the more fitted and the less. Neither to law nor to the state all men are equal nor even initially equal. The basic falsehood of equality behind the democratic principle vitiates it beyond repair. The humbug of equality is so patent that it would have been exposed and demolished ere long, if it had not been hedged in by provisos, special interpretations, and *argumentum ad hominum* of talented intellectuals.

The inefficiency, dilatoriness and expensiveness are indeed great weaknesses of democracy; but they are, in point of principle, secondary. The greater weaknesses and inherent viciousness of democracy arise from the very moral and intellectual regimen of majorities. The very idea of fishing for the votes of the majority introduces hypocrisy in public life and tendency to please the multitude by means to slacken self-control, and an inclination to pander to the passions of the populace by extending liberties and luxuries. The leader or representative or deputy has to look to the multitude for his support and he has to reach *their* level. Thus it is that we find not only more of libertine tendency in democracies to-day, but even the thin veil of decency and culture is cast off and a revolt against all established moral values is proclaimed.

‘What about Britain?’ it may be asked. Well, the British are a clever people and they have dressed their state so that they can don any nomenclature that would suit the trend of the times. The British government is not a democracy in essence. It is not a secular government either. It is a religious government. The King is the Defender of the Faith. The government is government by public opinion. A few good thinkers, statesmen and politicians make up the public opinion and there it goes. The sub-conscious effects of the presence of a hereditary sovereign on the whole people cannot be measured; but it distinguishes it from a democracy (beyond possibility of error), not to speak of the qualified suffrage and the House of Lords and other parts of the constitution. So the achievements of the British constitution are not on account of democracy, but perhaps in spite of it. Democracy would have upset a monarch but not on the plea of morganatic marriage.


Now let us turn to the other catchword which is usually tagged on to ‘democracy’ viz. Liberty. We need hardly repeat

the well known observation that absolute liberty of speech and action is not possible in any state whatsoever. But let us look at the question from another standpoint. Let us take it that there is something like *right* and something like *wrong*. This doctrine of liberty of speech and action for all, implies a fundamental disbelief in right and wrong. Who ever questioned man's liberty to do what was right and which of us would plead for the liberty to do the wrong ? But it will be said that a thing may be wrong in the eyes of one and right in the eyes of another. But this objection does not lead us anywhere, and represents exactly the attitude of the moral disbeliever. The State will not and as a matter of fact does not allow the liberty to do what it understands or believes to be wrong. Hence it is that sedition and treason are regarded as serious crimes in every state. Hence it is that some states like Russia do not allow liberty of speech, some like England cleverly allow all opinions to nullify each other, some like Italy arrange to manage them through corporations, and some like Germany lead and direct and control them by press, platform and education. The principle of liberty of speech would hardly work even in a family or a club. The speech has to be controlled by the principle of veracity and good taste. Even where the state seems to attack the liberty of speech it is not the liberty but the speech which it condemns. All criminal and civil legislation is a limitation of liberty. When a state like Russia can legislate on any matter as it likes the doctrine of liberty reaches its Nemesis.

Democracy, it is said, is the least bad and least tyrannous form of government. If you can parade about democracy and delegate powers to a few, even to one, if democracy can bring about conditions involving such crimes and gangsterdom as of New York, if it can bring about the destruction even of liberty of going to a church, if it can rule over conquered peoples as

over the Phillipines and the Negroes, if it can bring about conditions as in Spain or modern China, we need not scratch our eyes to see that it can be the worst and the most tyrannous form of government. And it has beaten all records within a couple of centuries by perverting the atmosphere of the whole world. Democracy is the worst from of government on account of the very basic errors of doctrine and it is all the more so because there is no escape from it when it goes wrong. The king can be dethroned, the tribunes can be displaced but the sovereign power installed by democracy ruling in the name of the people affords no remedy against its tyranny. Where is the remedy against a democracy misruling a subject nation or invading an innoxious people? People themselves would not do it, we may be told. There it is. The representation of a mass of humanity is a function impossible and untrue though conveniently kept up as a camouflage for public exploitation.

It is not for us here to suggest the alternative, though it is usually urged as a pretext that there is none. Let us first be convinced of the falsehood and failure of democracy and we shall not find human history and genius barren of examples and enlightenment. The great trouble about democracy is that everybody becoming a free-thinker in all directions, in the last consequence, all standards of morals, public opinion and ideals go to the wall. We do not deny that democracy has its own allurements. Everybody fancies himself to be somebody and it works as an opiate which intoxicates him while his power is nullified in a hundred and one ways. He thinks he is the lord of all he surveys while others really lord it over him. He wonders, stands aghast, calls for a change and gets from the frying pan into the fire. Hope alone remains in Pandora's ~~ballot-box~~ while all the other birds have flown away.



The Right of Dissociation

One question has loomed large of late before the Indian public, and it has caused not only a great amount of stir in the Hindu community but it has created intense bitterness and numerous misunderstandings in various quarters. It is the problem of Untouchability which was brought into front by Mr. M. K. Gandhi at the Nagpur Congress in 1920 A. D. There is a natural opposition to legislative measures for forcing the contact of certain castes amongst the orthodox Hindus. It is noteworthy that for the first several years, we do not find anything even in the resolutions of the Indian Social Reform Conference to show that any bitterness existed between touchables and untouchables in the matter. The word untouchability was invented but a few years ago and even now it is a misnomer. For, the religious untouchability which the Hindus observe is mutual or reciprocal. The religious Chamar understands it to be as much a part of his religious duty not to touch a Brahmin as the Brahmin thinks *vice versa*. In fact the position is that the Brahmin is enjoined not so much to refrain from touching a Bhangi or Chamar as to take a purificatory bath on having done so. Some standard of purity of a particularly wide religious type including hereditary, social, moral and spiritual contacts, is at the basis of these religious injunctions about untouchability.

It would be a travesty of facts to forget that cleanliness and purity are the fundamental features of men's physical and psychological well-being, and they are found in some form or other in all human groups. It would be difficult to say how far this element has penetrated the life of each particular group or-


individual. In a sense it is a personal matter, because it affects the very person of an individual and it is for his judgement and discretion how far, to what extent and under what circumstances, he will maintain or relax or resign a particular standard of purity and cleanliness. On the other hand it is also a social matter in as much as in the case of particular diseases and particular professions it may be in the interest of the society to segregate certain individuals or groups from the others, and we see this principle recognised by the institution of segregation camps, disinfections, and quarantines, as also racial bars in marriages of races of a very different blood, as in Europe and America.

This seems all very clear; but the plea has been made out on one of the most untenable assumptions hitherto swallowed by mankind, that *all men are equal*, therefore they must all be on an equal public status and that status is understood to involve touchability. Firstly it may be mentioned that this equality of all human beings is at best a social fiction. It is notorious how unequal men are, by nature, acquirements and abilities and to pose them as equal is nothing less than infidelity to Truth. Equality before law and equality before God are also theoretical fictions; for it is exactly to find out the inequality of criminality in conduct and its consequences and to judge accordingly that the courts are instituted. And God would be less than rational if he did not discriminate between the virtuous and vicious, the less and the more. All knowledge is essentially discrimination.

But even this would not be sufficient to satisfy those to whom levalization is more important than discrimination. And I should like to draw the attention of the political thinkers of our age to another very important and fundamental fact. I should think that the right of *freedom for dissociation* is a greater and more fundamental right than the right of freedom of association. I call it a greater right because it is more intensely a personal

right than the right of association; and it is more fundamental because it is a negative or passive right. A particular kind of association may bring another group or individual or state into trouble, but dis-association is the natural consequence of one's own desire to maintain one's own personality at a particular level of physical, moral or spiritual height and purity. It is well-known how the very laying of hands on another or mere touch in certain cases is regarded as the essence of criminal offence. And it is a matter of history how pure women have disallowed others to come in contact with their bodies. Perhaps that spirit was still distributing its aroma when Shakespeare made Romeo speak of Juliet's hand as a sacred shrine. It is of the essence of the problem of purity and cleanliness that there are degrees and ramifications in the will to do and not to do. And it will be found ultimately on analysis that it is the natural right of every human being to be allowed the freedom of dissociating wherever, whenever and with whomsoever he deems proper. And this right is not less valid when it concerns a group than when it concerns an individual. This being a fundamental right, it is the duty of the State to maintain its integrity and when the state by any measure, promulgated or permitted, introduces conditions which would destroy an established right of a group or an individual to dis-association, it fails in its duty to protect a highly fundamental right. And the groups that try to force such a measure are misusing their advantage, and introducing coercion where coercion is unjust and tyrannical.

The question is not whether you can or cannot pass a particular measure. It is not whether the current vocal public opinion is on your side or not. It is not whether you appear praiseworthy or otherwise in certain people's eyes. The whole point is, when you attack this right you are attacking a fundamental assumption of human society.



The Congress Credo

On principle the Congress as now run, can hardly claim to represent the whole country. A country-wide democratic body has to represent the people as they are. It cannot rule out and eliminate people on this, that and the other ground and still call itself representative of the whole country. By its political creed the Congress ousted the moderates, by its Khaddar mandate it ousted the rank and file of mere Swadeshists, by its anti-untouchability programme it ousted the orthodox Hindus, by its civil-disobedience *credo* it drove out the constitutionalists. A body that has to represent the country cannot set such barriers on opinion, belief and action at its gate.

It is the right of the public to know what are the positive or constructive things the Congress has to place before the electorates. The question is do the people see eye to eye with the Congress or its cabinet? Did they endorse the Nehru Report? Were they *against* the R. T. C. when it was boycotted and for it when it was attended by Gandhiji? Are they for the Communal Award at which the Congress cabinet is winking? Are they for the Poona-Pact which is its own Dictator's creation? Are they for its westernized outlook of politics? Are they for its policy of sacrificing the communities for a general, secular, social merger—the new vaunted social reconstruction? Are they with it in drifting towards communism which seeks to turn all established values topsy-turvy? Take away the general ground of partiality on account of its offering the strongest opposition to the British Government and you take away the wind from the Congress sails.

Now as regards the proposal for a Constituent Assembly. What about those who do not believe in the whims of the ballot-box? What about those who have no faith in the virtues

of democracies ? What about those who, on principle, do not believe in the value of one vote as equal to that of the other ? What about those who object to democracy, on principle, on account of its fundamental defect as the rule of the majority over the minorities ? What about those who believe that democracy has failed even in Europe and is more unsuited to Indian conditions even for the preliminary vote through a Constituent Assembly ?

And if the Congress represents the whole country where is the need of a Constituent Assembly ? No institution that has created such automatic bars to entrance, which is so out of tune with the cultural ideals and social order of the people and which is governed by an erratic and withal effective dictatorship can be said to represent the entire people.

Definition of "A Hindu"

The desire for having large numbers in the Hindu fold is laudable. But like all great religions, Hinduism is based on certain scriptures and the plain definition of a *Hindu* is one who believes in *Hinduism* i. e. the Religion based on the *Vedas*, *Smritis*, *Puranas* and other *Shastras*. Other ways of defining a Hindu are as slippery as they are unwarranted. Just as a general faith in the Bible and certain initial sacraments are usually the minimum, necessary for a Christian, so also it may be taken as regards Hinduism. The definition of a Hindu usually given by the Hindu Mahasabha as One who believes in any religion which had its origin in India, has created misunderstandings. It connotes neither a homogeneous religion nor a race and can include besides the Hindus proper, the Buddhists, the Jains, the Brahmos, the Sikhs and others who have no scriptures in common, some of whose tenets are mutually conflicting and

who themselves are against being dubbed Hindu. The result has been that the Shuddhi and Sangathan movements having a political countenance have come into being and have by way of reaction furthered the Tanzim and Tabligh movements amongst the Moslems. The Orthodox Hinduism is not out for conversion propaganda which practically has, as facts have shown, resulted in increasing bitterness between the Hindus and the Moslems. Conversions for honest spiritual longings should be always unobjectionable but those with a view to increase numbers for national ends are easily misunderstood and tend to create ill-will and retaliatory propaganda. In these days when all religion is attacked as fit to be thrown over-board, it would be enough if religions instead of fighting with one another for conversions, defended, conserved and strengthened their own adherants.

The humour of the situation is that the Arya Samajists who are dissenters at variance with the Hindus in the matter of several Hindu beliefs such as *image-worship*, *avatar*, *shraddhu* &c and who believe neither in the Smritis nor the Puranas nor the Upanishads, Aranyaka and *Brahmana* portions of the Vedas, are mostly carrying on the Shuddhi propaganda and the Moslems are enraged against all the Hindus in general and bad blood between the two communities is created. The Arya samajists representing a youthful religious movement may do the work of conversion as they like and they may get such communities as are pseudo-Hindus in their fold. The credit and responsibility of the Shuddhi movement should go to them. It should not be confounded as a Hindu movement. In fact *Shuddhi* means *Shuddhi* usually for Arya Samaj though it may go on in the name of the Hindu Mahasabha. The ruling of Hindu religious Heads, as representing Hinduism proper, is quite in consonance with the view that those are within the pail of a religion who give a general assent to its scriptures, though they may be weak in acting up to the ideal.

Religious Nationalism

There are clear signs that the intelligent Indian mind is veering round a new political symbolism. Some people blame Mr. Jinnah's mentality, but he is becoming an idol and power with the Moslems. Mr. Savarkar is similarly blamed on the other hand, but he is also growing into power with the Hindus. And both are, further, against the Congress: and the Congress is against them. Are these leaders roaming in the glomains? Or is it that some fresher vision has taken hold of the people, and which we have not properly appreciated? We have long made Nationalism our fondly-cherished principle, — naturally because our first paramount grievance is foreign domination. But as soon as we came in sight of autonomous power, the question as to what and who will take the place of foreign domination, became perhaps unpleasantly clear and insistent. The so called Hindu majority in the Congress incensed the Moslems and its so called Moslem bias incensed the Hindus. The Congress was in the position of one intending to befriend the whole without befriending the parts. The fact seems to be asserting itself that India believes in Nationalism, but not in Secular Nationalism. It believes in its

integral cultures and the respective homogeneity of its communities. The Congress shall have to take this into account if it is to represent the spirit of India.

Religious Nationalism is unfolding itself as India's political creed; — A nationalism which shall not suspend, supercede or supplant but respect, recognise and respond to the rights of all the religious communities in India. The nationalism which the Congress till now championed had its origin in secular nationalism inspired by European civilization and British history. It naturally aimed at unity and uniformity for generating power to achieve political liberty. Communities and cultures were to be subordinated and ultimately submerged under the secular ideal. The secular nationalism of the Congress, be it noted, was originally inspired by its founders like Bradlaugh who advocated the disestablishment of the Church, even in England. Secularism, it may be mentioned, is a school of materialistic free-thought which shelves all religious and spiritual considerations. The political emancipation needed a consolidated force behind, for which a levelization and new regimentation of society — mostly on the European model was thought to be necessary. These original tendencies are further asserting themselves in the movements towards Communism, class-war and a new social order.

India is a country in which Religion is deep-rooted in the people's life. Hence the popular mind revolted when it saw that beneath this secular nationalism the great cultures and communities of India were

loosing ground. In the meanwhile a new force in the shape of Mr. GANDHI came into the political field and insisted upon a religious bias to the Nationalism. It proclaimed the vision of Ramarajya and Dharma Rajya, and coalesced with the Moslems in the Khilaphat movement. It sought to remove the 'blot' on Hinduism and opposed untouchability. The original impulse of secularism, however, again asserted itself in the leftist movements of the Congress,—embodying Communism, class-war, and opposition to the Indian States. The ideological differences now became too apparent to be mistaken by the people. The recognition of the *de facto* communities has now to be made *de jure*, and the religions of the country are to be assured of a definitely recognised and unassailable status. Nor is this an unjust demand or unnecessary anxiety in view of the tendencies of mere Nationalism in Europe. India believes in Nationalism which says 'My Freedom' but it believes still more in Religious Nationalism which says "My Faith and My Freedom".

*

*

*

There are some who admit that there is a tendency towards Religious Nationalism, but are apprehensive about its results, and would secularize politics completely. I am afraid this prescription has been tried and found wanting. Looking back to the last fifty years in India we can say that the tension between the two major communities has increased with the accentuation of Secular Nationalism which has practically refused to recognize religions for which men are so often ready

to live and to die, and which has thus made the integrity of the communities more insecure against the combined might of those who believe in none or are suspicious of all. Further, the gravaman of history is also in the same direction. The Secular Nationalism of the Revolution brought the Reign of Terror and military dictatorship in France, and history has repeated itself much the same in Russia. This is not to be wondered at, because Secular Nationalism pure and simple, with changing values of moral standards, reduces itself practically to a tug of war in which might is right.

Hence we find that England, one of the strongest nations of to-day is practically moving on lines akin to Religious Nationalism. Its Sovereign is Defender of the Faith; it has ecclesiastical departments of the State; it has disallowed major changes in the Prayer-Book and morganatic marriage to the Royalty. Its motto is "Dieu et mon Droit." Religious Nationalism does not necessarily imply that religion should dominate politics; it means that it should qualify Nationalism; It implies that it should inform and guide politics into principles above those of the Ballot-box.

In this connection it would not be out of place to mention that Religion implies an integral set of principles, believed to be divinely ordained, and that Society shall always need a set of life-principles, whether of religion or communism or totalitarianism. ~~Some~~ differences and dissensions are an unavoidable ~~norm~~ of human society and to expect all harmony

and peace is to live in the Paradise of Ideals. The strifes for power and pelf would not die out with secularisation. In fact they will be more bitter, more uncompromising and less respectful of other people's feelings, as the last two years of Congress history has partly shown.

Religious Nationalism is India's age-long creed. Ashok, Shivaji, Pratap, Akbar and other names of Indian history which are an inspiration to-day bear it out. It being a type of Nationalism the love of independence is its necessary implication. India has never been indifferent to the ideal of Independence. It has fought again and again for it, but had in the wheel of time, after aeons of freedom, to succumb to stronger might of swords and guns. Even now it is keeping up the fight, with a spirit of non-violence. Those that like Dadabhai and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya respected religion to a fault, as well as those who like Mr. Gandhi, and Mr. Jinnah do so to-day are not the least amongst the fighters for freedom.

I do not think it is proper to complain that religion has failed to furnish a moral foundation for our struggle. One's country's freedom is a moral ground sufficient in itself and covered by Nationalism, which we do not underrate. Religion is the cultural asset above and beyond freedom, which makes the freedom worth having. Nor is the plea that politics and religion may be, so far as possible, under present conditions, kept apart, repugnant to our position;

though it must be remembered that they are not separate water-tight compartments and are often interwoven in practical life. Religious Nationalism does not mean the blind mixing up of politics and religion. Nor does it mean that religion should dominate politics in non-religious matters. It means that religion should inform and guide politics into principles above those of lust or lucre or the ballot-box. It refuses to accept that numerical might is right. The Religious Nationalist State respects the principles, ideals and values embodied in the people's religions, while the merely nationalist State can cast them to the winds on the strength of chance-majorities and snatch-majorities. Its attitude towards religion is merely negative: i. e. not to allow religion to interfere with the process of casual planning and it takes note of religion only when the public peace is in danger. Religious Nationalism keeps the new-found freedom from relapsing into barbarism.

It would not do to say "Ignore religions: Ignore communities." They are, for good or ill, the facts of our sub-continent. If the Moslems stick to their cultural integrity and the Hindus are not prepared to be levelized into a new-fangled non-communal nationality, the question is what is the remedy? The remedy lies, I believe, in recognizing facts as they are, without doctrinaire-prejudices. There are various communities in India with their integral cultures and they are not prepared to be boiled down to a new national amalgam, and to have their cultures gradually

brushed out of existence. This latter project of the secularist is most resented. The public policy should aim at the progress, prosperity and peace of the whole nation, recognizing at the same time the value of all religions and providing for their integrity. To attain this end it should give necessary cultural guarantees, require mutual religious tolerance and provide for due participation in material advantages.

Religious Nationalism should not be confounded with Communalism which refers everything to the interest of one's own community. The earlier secularism sticks to the Congress in spite of its unconscious drift the other way for tactical purposes. To keep up the pretence that it represented the Moslems the Congress got entangled in the Khilaphat and blank cheque and what not. To get into the good graces of the scheduled-class-voters it got into the temple-entry scrape. We want conscious Religious Nationalism, which aims at the freedom of the whole country, while keeping intact its integral cultures and communities. Its attitude would be different in the very handling of the problems. You may not find all the people of a country like India (as big as Europe minus Russia), ready for one Prayer-song, one Lingua Franca or one system of Educational Planning. The secularist at the first hitch, drops the prayer, forces a mixed jargon which is neither Hindi nor Urdu and foists manual training in education at the neglect of religious culture. Religious Nationalism would not be so much for levelization and uniformity as for the maintenance

of cultural values. It would not desecrate the Hindu temples at the bidding of a dissenter who pretends to understand their religion better than them all.

While mere nationalism looks for the relief from the foreigner, Religious Nationalism looks further ahead. It keeps in mind the ultimate ends of the State and arrests the tendency to the aggressive nationalism of the German type or the godless hotch-potch of the Russian model. We should not forget that India is an ancient country which has known numerous ups and downs and it is its spiritual and social inheritance which has kept it alive and gives it its status and mission in the world. Neither the Hindu nor the Moslem who knows the value of the inheritance would be satisfied with the cry "my country above all." For, country without culture is a mass of clay. If it is something to be an Indian in body - a Macaulay's Indian, - it must surely be some thing more to be an Indian in spirit and culture.



Communal Amity

I have often been wondering how the Hindu-Moslem problem has been made more difficult by wrong handling I have often felt, strangely enough, that the lines suggested by the leaders of the Moslem League for their progress and safety are very near to those which should *mutatis mutandis* be applicable to the Hindus also. The reasons are not far to seek. A good Hindu and a good Moslem are very much alike in the aspirations of life. They are also alike in their strong partiality for the principles of self-control and renunciation. They are alike also in their loyalty to religion and religious ties beyond all physical considerations. They are alike in belonging to a spiritual brotherhood which is international and humanitarian in its scope.

When I reflect upon the onslaught of materialistic nationalism and atheistic Bolshevism in modern times, I am inclined to think about the need of all religions combining together for saving the invaluable moral and spiritual assets of the human race. This fighting for bits of land and lucre in the name of nationalism sinks into insignificance before the higher goal of human life. I have often sat down admiring

the *Fakir* who himself in tatters, is carrying on the message of life and salvation from man to man. I have never blamed the Moslem leaders for their partiality to Communal Representation, though I have shrewdly suspected whether Mr. Jinnah would ever wish communal representation to be abolished. I have myself felt that the Hindus even should have communal representation, though to talk of it in these days is an anathema. I believe that not only representation but even the method of representation is a cardinal point in the political theory. If you remove men from their natural groups of coherence and tag them by accidents of location and wealth, the results may easily be made absolutely different and undesirable. The Hindus have begun to understand the implications of 'non-Moslem groups' and such other phrases, and have begun to feel resentment against them. The tendency of Congress Nationalism is towards suppressing all communities and dissolving them into a dead amalgam of nationalism. The dominant aim is to drown all distinctions to turn the Indian people into a big flock able enough to drive out the foreigners.

I have often been thinking of the history of the Congress and I have felt that it was inspired from top to bottom by European or rather British ideology. It imported the ideas of democracy, Parliamentarianism, equality of men, gradual revolution, opposition to the Government, love of wealth, monetary basis of society, free trade economics, freedom of the sexes, and all

that these ideas connote and imply. This phenomenon was not strange, because, its leading pioneers were Britishers and the inspiration came from British history and British literature. It happened of course that these alien ideas could not make much headway in the beginning and the Congress remained a small body out of touch with the people for a long time. The British Government noted the thing which concerned it viz. the spirit of revolt against the Government in the Congress. It tried to discourage it but the historic fact and strange anomaly of the subjection of a highly civilised sub-continent to a small country like England, was too apparent to be got over and the people could easily understand it. This circumstance gave tremendous backing to the Congress and in spite of its European idealogy, it made some headway. Social reform amongst the people so as practically to westernize the whole society, was but another side of the congress shield, and the Indian Social Conference met for several years in the same pandal, as the congress finished its sessions. The Congress has radicalized its political ideal into Poorna-Swarajya or Complete Independence but the British idealogy has stuck to it, mostly in spite of the fact that several times to save the situation it has paraded religious non-interference when necessary. It ignored the fact that the spiritual basis of society was a better and nobler basis than the mere political basis of nationalism which changes its boundaries with every political upheaval.

The Moslems were the first to see through these things and wake up in time. They became alive to the fact that the raising of the national ideal implied the suppression of the communities which in its turn implied the overthrow of religion and the religious basis of society. The pseudo-Hindus or others who led the Congress were too much steeped in the national ideal to see the values of the various Indian cultnres which they were preparing to sacrifice or to keep only in shadows. It is not impossible that some might have counted upon overruling the Moslems by an institution which was nationalist in name while dominantly Hindu in personale. Then again, in such a communally negative body oommunal indifferentists got an advantage. "I am an Indian first and a Hindu, Moslem or Parsee next" became a passage of pride in political addresses. The people, as they usually are, were ready to cheer anything provided it came from the prevailing party. The national ideal was obviously a physical ideal and we have of late known plentifully its results and implications when the spiritual ideal from behind (either of a Christian or Moslem or Hindu brotherhood) is taken away and thrown to the winds. The Moslems saw, as I have said before, through the thing, and they raised up their own banner, saying in effect that whatever became of the other communities, they were not going to fall in the frying pan for boiling all into a strange amalgam and they asked for communal representantion in the Councils and Legislatures of India; and as they saw in course of time that these pseudo-Hindus of the Congress were progressing in

heresy and condemnation of their own religious tennets and were inclining towards Atheism and Bolshevism, their anxiety to have more dominating position in the legislative and executive bodies progressively increased. Without claiming to represent them I may say that their main interests are religious and cultural. It is so also with the teeming millions of conservative Hindus. The difference is that the Moslem being fewer and more backward in assimilating western culture, have been more easily and sooner welded together; while the Hindus being more numerous and their westernized portions having gone over to a very powerful body like the Congress, their coherence into a conservative group has become very difficult. The Hindu Mahasabha has indeed come into the field but having come into the hands of protestants and dissenters like the Brahmo-Samajists, Arya-samajists and other reformed Hindus, its loyalty to the orthodox Hinduism has been nil and it has worked more or less as a political institution taking the side of the Hindus as against the Moslems. The work of the Mahasabha has especially been necessary and popular after the Congress under the leadership of Syt. M. K. Gandhi began to woo and placate the Moslems for the obvious purpose of parading its claim as the one representative body of India. Some time back Gandhiji was going to give the Moslems a blank cheque without perhaps realizing that he was counting upon drawing from the money of those whom he did not represent. Now the Moslem league and the Congress have been clean separate, the League representing the Moslems

on the one side and the Congress representing mostly the westernized nationalist Hindus on the other.

There is no doubt that the Moslems have also their patriotism as the reformed Hindus and conservative Hindus have theirs. Patriotism or love for one's own country is an instinct ingrained in the human mind. It is only when this love is dedicated to the noblest aims of human existence that it becomes worthy of admiration. So also, the desire to possess more of power and pelf is a common desire which has a great appeal in democracies where men and mobs are to be managed. The Moslem leaders as well as the Hindu leaders may feel a natural craving for more power, more jobs and more representatives. These are however concerns secondary to the greater issues involved in the preservation or extinction of cultural assets and religious institutions. In the fourteen points advanced by Mr. Jinnha the same cultural anxiety is discernible. In fact, the fundamental principles and practices, we call **Religion**; its general effect on society we call **Culture** and the group which believes in it we call **Community**.

I do not think that the expression communal unity is well-chosen. In fact, neither the Moslems nor we Hindus want that unity which is envisaged by the materialistic nationalism of the Congress. What we want is amity between all the various communities of India and that I believe can be easily attained by proper means to the end. All those great communities which love their religion and believe in

it as the Saviour of their Souls must be guaranteed the respectful recognition and safe preservation of their respective religions or creeds. As regards the loaves and fishes of the mundane world of politics, I believe, the Hindu, the Moslem, the Christian, the Sikh, and the rest can reconcile themselves to a proportionately distributed justice. They are all trained by their religions to self-denial and sense of brotherhood. This is truer than the westernized mind can recognize. Not that there would be no quarrels over fishes and loaves. But the fundamental amity can be established. In Hindu and Moslem Native States both the communities have lived peacefully together; nay, I have even observed that a Moslem State has often a Hindu Minister while a Hindu state chooses a Moslem Dewan. It is when you align yourself against the fundamentals of another that tolerance becomes difficult if not almost impossible.

Now as regards some of the bones of contention between the Hindus and Moslems. I am not unaware of the fact that some good Moslems as well as some good Hindus have been of opinion that really speaking these points are not worthy enough to make us break our heads against one another. In this connection, I am inclined to doubt the wisdom of the Shuddhi-Movement as a means for increasing number as also the Tabligh Movement with a like purpose. Genuine conversions on account of a change of spiritual vision altogether, are events which are sometimes great, some times tolerable but always allowable. But I doubt

whether conversions with a political mentality behind them can do much for either community. If the Amir of Afghanistan can stop cow-slaughter in his country, I do not know how it should be religiously necessary for Moslems to do it in India. I have no doubt that with more friendship for the Hindus, my Moslem brethren would be able to perform their sacred prayers, in spite of a little noise outside the mosques, with equal efficacy and concentration as they did before. I doubt the wisdom both of the Hindus and the Moslems in their insistence on such matters to the point of creating bad blood and breaking heads. I think neither true religious fervour nor higher spiritual life can be benefitted by such scuffles and antipathies. It is possible, perhaps, that there are historical grounds working behind the mentality, but I have found that the Hindus as well as the Moslems had learnt to forget and forgive the bitter memories of the past. The present ill-will is a new-comer born of political self-seeking and self-assertion which the traditions of both the communities have always assessed at a value inferior to that of religion and culture.

The greater issue which should induce all the religious communities to make a common cause together is the increasing power of materialistic and atheistic forces which threaten to overpower the religious momentum. There is another reason why any political constitution in India must be broad-based on perfect religious safe-guards and religious non-interference. Even

in such a country as England the bulk of whose people believe in one religion, viz. Christianity, there have been rebellions and civil wars on account of religious differences. India is a land with at least half a dozen religions. The variety can either be effaced by making all people godless as in Russia or be ennobled into a variety with a Spiritual Unity behind. It is not that the Hindu, Moslem and other communities of India must join only in seeking Independence but they shall have to do so for preserving the very Soul of their community. It is in a country like India with intense spiritual fervour that the dead materialistic *unity* of all communities is least possible while *amity* based on a spiritual view of life is most natural. The Britishers first injected the *virus* of so called unity, the Congressites swallowed it and made a fetish of it and now the Britishers and even the rank and file of the Congress ask for Unity, not with a vengeance but with their tongues in their cheeks.

The Moslems are right also in pointing out that democracy is not suited to Indian conditions. Why, it was never suited to any conditions. It has always been the foil with which political managers have managed the people. With a country like India in which there are numerous communities and heterogeneous interests and which has an expanse almost as big as that of Europe *cum* Russia, democracy is not only bound to fail but it is bound to be ruinous to the great and abiding interests of the people. It is hardly necessary now to say that Moslems are as conserva-

tive as the bulk of the Hindus, that their fundamental vision of life is spiritual and religious and that the Hindus and Moslems can be friendly and tolerant to each other if the right lines of action are taken by those who hold the reins of the society and the state in their hands.

The hoax of India being a unitary country to be governed by *one* Government seems to have been invented for those whose interests lay in being arbitrators or intermediaries between its different peoples and nations. It was swallowed up by pseudo-politicians without understanding its implications. India is really a sub-continent of several nations and nationalities, differing in their language, customs, culture and traditions. It was united for several centuries by religion and it is partly so even to-day, in so far as it is Hindustan, the land of the Hindus. As the original Vedic Religion on which the Hinduism is based is the parent of all religions, so also India is the original Home of Humanity. It is but a dispensation of the Divine Providence that various races of the human kind should again find a home or a rendezvous in India. Most of the present Moslems are but the progeny of Hindus converted to Islam under the Moslem rule I do not feel the least dejected when I see the Moslems strong in their faith and fervour. It is the spirit of religion, — the spirit of dedication of the whole life unto God that counts. It is the smaller men that care only for the outer show of things. Who knows that but for the

Moslems who are a match for the Congressites, the importance of Religions in the State and in Politics would have come into prominence in these days in India? I do not think it a forlorn hope that the Moslems of India may one day appreciate cordially the parent religion of their fore-fathers and revere their great Prophet all the same. If the fundamental religious and cultural interest of the Moslems as well as the Hindus are assured of safe continuance and protection, there is every hope that a moderately satisfactory condition of *Amity* can be produced and the very desire for Pakistan may melt away into the wider sympathies of Religious Brotherhood for the betterment and happiness of a warring and fallen humanity.



Implications of a Constituent Assembly

The Congress has proposed a Constituent Assembly for evolving India's political Constitution. The assumptions behind the proposal of a Constituent Assembly are that all people believe in Democracy and rule by the will of the Majority, that they believe in the representative machine as proper and adequate, and that it is possible to evolve an *all-agreed* constitution through its means. All these assumptions are unwarranted. Without entering into the theoretical merits or demerits of democracy of the present type, it may be said that the trend of the people's mind is not on that side. If the people were for a pure democracy as implied by a Constituent Assembly, Mr. Gandhi with all his Himalayan blunders and intolerable fads would not have continued to be worshipped and the Subhas Bose episode would hardly have happened. Indian problems cannot be solved by the European ways and means. The people are not democratically-minded. In a sort of general hubub and agitation which a Constituent Assembly would mean, agitators would carry things in their favour without

affording time, opportunity and means to the real leaders the people to express themselves. Since the Simon Commission, it has been the consistent policy of the Congress to gag others on the one hand and express itself on the other. It needs colossal efforts of a Moslem League to withstand its cumulated power and pressure.

The people believe in the continuance of their political, social and religious institutions under right leadership. The mischief of materialistic-leadership under the shield of nationalism is that while it parades the necessity of independence, it practically aims at transferring the authority in its own hands and thus leads the country into the catastrophe of a general Revolution as in France in the 18th century or Totalitarianism as in Russia and Germany in recent times. This is what the people do not want as is shown definitely by the strong Moslem and Hindu movements for their own cultures and the strong reaction against the totalitarianism of the Congress. It would be an abuse of political advantage to attempt settling the Indian Constitution by representatives set up with a whirlwind agitation as that of the Congress. It is notorious that in election coercions of various types are used and that in a country like India, all people have not been trained to understand the value and assert the power of a free vote. I know even of university-men bringing in and being subject to these influences of coercion. Again it is relevant to the whole situation that though the

Congress may represent the people in the desire for Independence it does not follow that the people are with it in the desire for a Democracy. They have seen too much of municipalities and councils to long for such regimes. For a big sub-continent like India, democracy would only mean the exploitation of the people and the steam-roller-levelising of its cultures. What we Indians want is *Indian India* not an India modelled after the debris of European ideologies. We do not want merely a change of masters from white westerners to dark westerners. We want the Hindus to be governed by Hindu laws, customs, and traditions and the Moslems want to be governed by theirs. It may be that one community may be a Nitrate and the other Sulphur. They may be of different natures. But we do not want them to be mixed up into an explosive. The late efforts of the Congress in that line have shown, if anything, that they have served merely to make the differences, disputes and estrangements more acute and more bitter; and the Constituent Assembly is bound to repeat the same story and tend to the dislocation of the people's cultural rights and institutions. The fault lies in the very aim of ultimately negating the communities, which are real homogeneous groups of integral cultures.

It must be noted that representative institutions for eliciting public opinion do not mean the same thing as democracy which refers to the final and absolute powers in the hands of the people. This in its turn means power in the hands of the majority

of the representatives. Even in representative institutions it is necessary in a country like India to allow the natural social groups to operate in grouping for votes. In this connection, I may refer to the system of representation, detailed by me elsewhere, (Vide P.P. 103-109) by group-units of a hundred each, voluntarily formed for electing the primary board of electors. This process would eliminate the question of communal electorates. If members of a community want to vote together, they may; if they do not want, they may not. And further in the matter of groups, the Voluntary Principle is naturally better than a compulsory principle as of mere locality or tax-limits or community. If we analyse the genesis of the minorities it would be found that there is the cultural basis underlying and the fear of the Moslems is wholly justified in as much as the Congress command has made short work even of religious matters like Temple-entry of even the (their own?) Hindu community in spite of its *de facto* majority. The communal problem cannot be solved by Constituent Assembly because it is likely to be at its basis. The need is to give complete religious safeguards to all communities whether they be in majority or in minority. An India with the new-fangled democracy would be to use Mr. Gandhi's own phrase a "Jack-daw in borrowed feathers."

Looking at the panorama of the political history of the last fifty years, one is inclined to think that there have been three or four *modus operandi* for

attaining India's political aim. The first has been that of Exposure and Demand by the moderate mentality, the other of Terrorism by the extremist mentality and the latest is that of Civil Disobedience by the passive resistance mentality. There is hardly any doubt that in the first stage the impact acted more for national cohesion and that what the British Government gave, was given and received with cordiality. During the second stage bitterness between the rulers and the ruled increased and the Government took strong measures against terrorist extremism. The third stage has proved not only equally futile in securing Swaraj or good-will, but it has by its incitement to a settled spirit of revolt in all spheres of life, brought about a state near to "anarchy and red ruin" in society. Attempt to settle the constitution by Constituent Assembly in the present condition of India, would be but a preparation to a violent and perhaps fatuous Revolution, which, again, Mr. Gandhi is so much opposed to.

We have to realise that Swaraj does not necessarily mean democracy. It means certainly the Government of India by Indians, in the interest of Indians, according to Indian traditions, and in line with the established Indian ideals. The plain position now is that India is governed by Britain, though with the help of Indians. The power of governing can be transferred to India by the Sovereign which possesses it, unless it be wrenched from it by war and revolution. If it is given by it, it can be

given either willingly or unwillingly, either by parts or in totality. The best way in which it can be transferred and the way creditable to both sides is that in which it is given willingly i. e. with good grace, and given in totality. It may again be borne in mind that when there is monarchy, Imperialism in theory does remain and all the more so when there is an ideal of a Federation of countries or nations behind it. Imperialism and monarchy are in opposition to democracy but not to public weal, nor to national prosperity or to national greatness, as may be observed from the instances of England and Italy. The difficulty in the way of an absolute democracy for India from the British point of view would have reference to the King and the Empire, and from the Indian point of view to the Indian States which the Congress has already begun to handle. To destroy the status of Indian States is not a part of the problem of Indian Independence from foreign control. It has been surreptitiously thrust in. Independence to foreign control is one thing and revolution on the democratic ideology in the very Indian States is another. One feels that we are being led into a slavish imitation of the western political theories by the Congress in tagging even our Native States to the problem of Indian Swaraj. There can be no more radical instance of perversity in the outlook of the Congress than its incitement to the people of the Indian States against their own and often beloved Indian Rulers and creating unrest where there was none.

Even Mr. Gandhi has had good experience to know that politics is a dingy, dirty, duplicate game all over the world and the greatest mischief of democracy is that it involves the whole people in its quagmire, with responsibilities for which they are ill-prepared and liabilities which are terrible; and practically puts them in the hands of their casual managers as if they themselves had no ideology of their own. The very argument for democracy that it *can* and *does* change its rulers and policies from time to time is a committment betraying a permanent loss of ideals and mere slavery to casual or caucus majorities.

There has been an insistence for clarifying the aims of the present war as affecting India, and particular interests have caught up the word 'Democracy' It is notorious that a much advertised medicine that claims to be remedial for all diseases is usually a quack-production. I do not see why we should be enamoured of *absolute* democracy for India while it is wholly out of line with her traditions and ill-suited to her present conditions. If *complete independence* of a country can exist *without* pure democracy the latter is not, apparently enough, the requisite of Independence, but only of particular interests. Why can we not have, a constitution as in England or some enlightened Indian States? England has a King, it has its House of Lords temporal and spiritual, it has its House of Commons and it has its Fourth Estate. It is well-known that absolute democracy or Rule by the people has been found to be impracticable or undesirable by many

political thinkers and powers of to-day, for the plain reason that people are prone to be misled and exploited against their interests. Even as Bernard Shaw puts it about Democracy we may say: Government of the people: Of course: Government for the people: Certainly: Government by the people: Absurd. I doubt whether absolute democracy has succeeded anywhere in a country with such a large, varied and heterogeneous population as India. India is a sub-continent of many nationalities and cultures and it is bound to suffer under party-rule, especially when the majority-party is over-confident of its ideology and insistent in forcing it through. Even the little experience that we have had of such a rule in the Congress-governed provinces has brought us flagrant instances viz. of Prohibition in Bombay, compulsory Hindi teaching in Madras and Hindu Temple-Entry legislation in both - a sort of legislative coercion in social and religious matters that was not seen during the last hundred years even in British India. That there has been strong public opposition to them cannot be denied and the value of the opposition is all the greater as being against a *national party in power*. It means that there is something rotten in the very scheme of democracy as applied to India. Mr. Churchill with his usual foresight pointed it out long before.

What then, we are asked, is the alternative? The answer is we want a government above parties, looking absolutely to the general welfare and prosperity of the people and governing them in accordance

with their religious and cultural traditions. There is something sinister in planning systems to a 'New Order' which to many an enthusiast is the Russian order, (which, by the by, has seen it necessary to resort to the most intolerant Dictatorship.) Have not Manu, Christ and Mahomet and other divines planned society well enough that we should be in need of Totalitarian planners *de novo*? Neither good Hindus nor good Moslems are willing to be steam-rolled into a dead level of materialistic nationalism which tends to gradually swallow the communities out of existence. They are naturally for a constitution in line with Indian traditions which include constitutional Kingship, continuance of religious cultures, convenience to all for ventilating grievances and opinions; and a government involving less burdens, better morals and general prosperity. Absolute democracy is an alien system; we do not want it; and the Congressites who consider even Indian States as anomalous, are, in spite of their khaddar, but aliens in their political ideology having poor right to dictate the type of Indian Constitution. This bid for contract-management of the people under democracy with powers of a Totalitarian state would prove obnoxious in any country but it would work as a positive bane in India.



British Conservatism

(A letter to Mr. —)*

We have read with deep interest the long cable report of the proceedings of the Queen's Hall meeting of the 4th Instant I congratulate you upon the bold stand you are making against the further thrust of western democratic system in India and upon the exposure of fallacies made by your Party.

May I point out that the pose and policy of bestowing the gift against the protests of the intended recipients is, to say the least, ridiculous ? The British Government are in a hurry to pass the New Constitution because they think something has to be done. But the something wanted is different from the something proposed and hence in this 'blindman's buff' the Government is playing the wrong game. It is as funny as if the parents gravely said that their good girl deserved to be married and then set up marrying her to the man she protested against; and post haste for such a settlement is the most humorous part of

* No apology is needed for now publishing this letter to a great conservative to whom the British people have now made greater than the great. It was very kindly acknowledged.

the situation. It makes the whole thing all the more suspicious.

"There is sympathy for Indian ideals " as Mr. Baldwin said, and more is wanted. But what is wrong is the way of translating it into action. We are under no illusion that you who are cynically dubbed as die-hards are no better or worse friends of India than Baldwinites; but the time is approaching not only for India but for other countries as well when the conservatism of all nations shall have to put its whole strength together to fight the growing forces of moral disruption and disorder, which bid fair to make a China of every country. Many Indians have come to feel that this democratic system is being introduced not in good faith but to placate some moderate politicians and to divide India by internal wrangles and fights against one another. The Congressites are of course against the new constitution but even the loyal Hindus are also set up against the same by their religion having been throwing overboard in the J. P. C. Report. Religions are left to the mercy of moral indifferentists, religious dissenters and social revolutionaries who are likely to dominate Indian politics under the democratic system which is wholly unsuited to the country. We conservative Hindus would think it nothing less than a betrayal of India on the part of the Baldwinites to throw religions thus overboard in spite of knowing that "the" great essential factors of British Parliamentary Government do not exist in India. The transfer of power is a good idea, but 'to

whom' is the fundamental issue. Have you inquired how many of the Hindus who attended the Round Table Conference were not out of their own caste-groups for breaking with their respective cultural traditions? You are right in your main say that "Britain is forcing democratic Parliamentary institutions in India when they were failing in so many countries to give the elementary guarantees of justice and individual freedom," and that the proposed reforms will increase discontent instead of allaying it.

There is, indeed, a fundamental difference between your and our angles of vision. But there are both lines of divergence and centres of contact in our stand-points. You would like to keep India, we would like it to be free: that is the divergence of our lines of view. The party in power in Government now proposes to throw everything overboard provided it can save itself and keep England on the half-way house between apparent abdication and under-ground power. We conservatives in India, — and the main population is still conservative, — want freedom and Swaraj certainly but not through Communism or with the overthrow of our cultural heritage. The revolutionaries in India want it at any cost. They would burn the home and its cultural traditions, to reconstruct, as they would fondly say, on the ruins after making the land their own. The present party in power in the Government in the process of abdicating before the conflagration, would not even help those who would save their cultural possessions. You, Sir, will have done your

task for us, or *with* us, if you please, if you get us Cultural and Religious safe-guards and prevent the further thrust of democracy. It would be little short of tyranny to force the doubtful experiment on India with the power of stratagic forces at the disposal of the Government; but what is more, it will be an egregious blunder.

You will perhaps ask us whether we Conservatives have anything constructive to offer. We have, I say advisedly, plenty of it and more. But allow me to tell you frankly that to-day in India the people consulted are mostly those who are rather *hot* for the Government. The British model is their model, and it is superfluous for me to add that the White Paper Scheme is the result of such premium to them. The majority of Indian people have no interest for such constitutional reforms as are in the air now. To them the present constitution is as good or as bad as the one proposed. Give them an Indian Viceroy or Indian Governors and see the change in their attitude. Give them religious safeguards and religious education and see the results in a decade. The revolutionaries, actual and potential, do not want these things, cleverly enough, though not wisely; for, these things would soon quell the gathering storm. The people want them; the Government *can* give those things but do not care to. This cultural animosity is the cruelest cut of all.


And what, Sir, are the Conservative principles on which Mr. Baldwin claimed to take you to task?

With what face, I ask, does Mr. Baldwin, who, knowing the growing Communist menace has allowed Indian religions to be thrown overboard in the proposed constitution, quote and recall Disraeli's conservative principles including *the maintenance of religion*, and talk of the struggle for defeating Socialism? The day is past when you could differentiate Christianity as religion and other religions as false faiths. All are now in the same boat. They swim or sink together. Conservatism is not a coat, it is the spirit of preserving the best moral and spiritual traditions of the human race.

We want *Indian India*, — not a Westernized India. Any conservatism true to its spirit would not force a foreign political system on an ancient people who had exhibited the vitality to live through so many centuries of human history as India has done. The sense of unity we want to promote is through our cultures, and not by their overthrow under the new materialistic nationalism. The Government will soon find, if they put in these new reforms, that they have caught a Tartar. No amount of time spent, or machinery used, for sifting matters can rectify the fundamental errors of principle. You are perhaps too well aware how libertinism under a thousand masks has surreptitiously invaded, under all democracies, the people's godliness and religion which we prize so much here in India. And there is evidence gathering of what public inequities, frauds and atrocities are in store under a godless 'rule and line' of politics. You, Sir, have the

advantage of a Christian foundation below your whole political edifice. You can afford the democracy of a type with the conventional safeguards. But to us a democracy without the backbone of religion, nay even without religious guarantees, would be a veritable thrust from behind. It is, Sir, not a question of time, for giving such a constitution; it is a question of principle, - the conservative principle of respect for the ancient religions and cultures of a country, which should stop your conservative friends from delivering over India to a wholly materialistic pseudo-democratic system. If you fail in your endeavours we shall feel that the British Conservatism has been false to itself but you shall have done your duty.

9th December, 1934.



Religious Education

The secular basis of the Indian and especially University Education has been definitely harmful to the rulers and the ruled, the principles of secularism, - which is avowedly a kind of free thought (*vide* Holyoake's Principles of Secularism) being highly damaging to all religious belief without which "morality stands on sand". The western educational system, even in Europe, has been instrumental in accelerating the forces of disruption, disorder, disunion and defiance. The prevailing system of Indian University education has been found highly unsatisfactory in its tendencies on the various nationalities in India, partly by denationalizing them and partly by multiplying the type of what Lord Curzon aptly satirized as the anglicized Indian. It has introduced tendencies towards irreligion, money-greed and materialism which are potent forces for national deterioration; it has introduced scepticism in the realms of the intellect, libertinism in that of morals, and opportunism in that of economics. It has created ambitions, political, social, and economical - individual as well as national - which legitimately culminate, as

European history shows, in the catastrophe of Bolshevism. It has indirectly promoted discontent amongst the people against the Government by its tendency to undo the people's great civilization and heritages and to waylay the nation's intellect into the quagmire of disbelief, despondency, and vagaries of the ballot-box. It has promoted the desire and leanings towards democracy which is highly unsuited to the Indian conditions. People have "been westernized into headlong obedience to strange doctrines."

Religion which is ingrained in the Asiatic character and is the very life-blood of the Indian people ought to be the integral part of education. Materialism and its allied doctrines are on their trial in Europe : the experiment has so far resulted in keener struggle for existence, larger national indebtedness, greater amount of discontent and crime, and more devastating wars and revolutions. The introduction of western culture of such a type has been an error in India and deserves to be remedied as early as possible for the peace of country. Lord Macaulay's view has fructified with a vengeance. The higher education in India should conform to the accredited beliefs, ideals, usages and traditions of the Indian people. It should be not revolutionary but resuscitative, not Western but Indian.

It may be said that religion is the cause of dissention and strife. In fact it is not so. Men fight for whatever intimately touches them - religion, power, wealth, honour, as the case may be; the ostensible occasions are changed to suit the fighting propensities

in human nature. But the strifes of religion, though insistently magnified have taken but a much smaller toll of human life than claimed by the forces that have been let loose after religion was dethroned. It may be objected that the different religions in India are turbulent enough even now and may become more turbulent without the levelizing tendencies. It is not likely to be so. The people *were* more religious half a century ago and were less quarrelsome. Religious knowledge would further its translation into actual life. At present religion has slipped off and religious pride has remained; hence the troubles and brawls have multiplied. The principle of self-control is shelved and that of self-assertion dominates. Some people would not like to see these antiquated things revived. Yes, those who are trained under the present secular system are likely to do so. But the people in general still have an intimate regard for religion. The Hindu wishes to remain a good Hindu and the Mahomedan a good Mahomedan. ("India is a continent of independent nations united by a common federation of nations.") These different nationalities or communities, if you like, do not wish to be rubbed out into a new alloy. They aspire to an ideal of federated nations. All religions are united in their general import. It is some times said that religion is a stumbling block in progress, and may be allowed to gradually disappear. I do not think so. Religion is the back-bone of human character and the effective fountain-head of the great virtues and noblest traits that adorn humanity. Without religion man would soon deteriorate into a

beast. It may be argued that religion is a matter of the individual's personal interest, not of public exhibition. The reply is that religious instruction is the function of education, though the translation of that instruction into practice is the individual's personal concern. Education is a force and religious instruction would determine the character of that force. It may be said by some that we do not want the peaceful, freezing teachings of religion; nowadays, we want fighters. I would ask, is it not desirable that we may have *better* fighters in a *better* cause?

It may be remarked that we need give no premium to superstition in this scientific age. The reply is that science is by the by confirming some of the so called superstitions with its experimental hall-marks. And who after all may be preferred, the superstitious or the supercilious? A belief does not become a superstition by being dubbed so; after all there is not much fear of people being unbecomingly superstitious in this rationalistic age! "We may not" in the words Augustine Birrel "proscribe mysticism; it is the main factor of that ideal world by which all human progress is conditioned." It may be pointed out that there would be many practical difficulties in working out this principle. Indeed difficulties there are likely to be when serious departure is to be made from the trodden path; but they would not be insurmountable and need not be magnified in advance. Instruction classes in sacred texts may have to be arranged on a denominational basis. The step shall not only be

desirable but extremely popular. It may be said that an alien Christian Government cannot introduce religious education on the basis of *other* religions. My reply to this objection is that it is more desirable that a foreign Government should promote education on the basis of the people's ideals, traditions and usages rather than impose upon its subjects an education which is not only against the grain but has proved of doubtful utility and positive harm. While Christian influences are being disestablished in Europe the Government need not be so touchy on Christian religion as not to admit the study of other religions in their respective followers. It may be remarked that the religious teaching will be counteracted by the other surroundings and tendencies which draw their forces from elsewhere. The remark is partly true; but our aim should be to stick to the good and counteract the evil *as far as possible under the circumstances.*

University education should therefore be Indianized in spirit by substituting the religious instead of the secular principle in education, — connoting, in effect, faith instead of scepticism, character instead of libertinism, and benevolence and sympathy instead of self-interest and self-assertion. It should be Indianized in substance by the introduction of (a) accredited Indian text-books (b) Indian subjects of study, such as the Indian Medical Science, Theology, etc., and (c) Text-books written from Indian points of view. It should be Indianized in method by (a) the

introduction of the vernaculars as the media of instruction, and (b) simplifying the surroundings of the life of the student. It should be Indianized in personnel by a greater utilization of men who have been sympathetic students of Indian culture and civilization. And lastly, it should be Indianized in atmosphere by a simplicity of physical surroundings, by a closer relationship to Indian ideals, institutions and usages.

The aim of education is as infinite as human hopes, as pure as human aspirations and as vivid and as dim as Divine Providence itself. It is, in rough words, to provide for the harmonies of life, to mould the child into good man or good woman. It is its primary business to make the individual good at heart even more than efficient in wits, - which efficiency is more dangerous if it moves in the wrong direction.



The Balance Sheet

I have been curiously noting how the ancient cultural practices of India are shining all the better in the light of reason and practice as more and more points of view and information are coming before us. I remember how in our early days there was a tirade of condemnation of Hindu Religion and Philosophy till the European scholars and savants found to their amazement that the Hindu Social system was the most tenacious and long-lived in the world-history and the French and German thinkers found in Indian Philosophy the 'solace of their life' and the 'solace of their death'. The modern European civilization has in the meanwhile begun to crack like a house of cards. Madame Blavatsky of Russia and Colonel Olcott of America have based a whole system of theosophy and philosophy on the Indian system of 'Yoga' and the 'Upanishads' and the great teachings and personalities of Swami Vivekanand, Ravindranath Tagore, Prof. Radhakrishnan and Gandhiji have made the name of India and Indian culture respectable throughout the world. India, its culture and its philosophy though not practically believed in, have become more

respected to-day both on account of their inherent value, as well as on account of the multiplied experiences and blood-baths, that Europe has undergone during the last hundred and fifty years. In fact years and events have shown that the balance of reason is on the side of India. More correctly speaking it is not simply in favour of India, but in favour of the *wisdom and light of humanity* that India has duly conserved.

Let us take the principal things with which mankind is concerned, one by one in turn. Let us first take up *Chronology*. Old European thought regarded the Universe and mankind about six thousand years old. The Indian Chronology according to the sacred texts of the Puranas runs into millions of years;—the last cycle having commenced about three and a half million years ago. The geologists as well as the biologists and physicists agree now in setting down the origin of the Universe and of Man to figures ranging to millions, thus vindicating the position of Indian chronological beliefs.

It may be mentioned here in passing that the light that we in India have received was based mainly on 'Yogic' perceptions. The *Rishies* in their 'Yogic' trances saw the whole Truth as in a vision and they translated it unto the human race. Thus we have had with us the Light Divine in all its purity, totality and multisidedness. Hence to those who have faith in it we need not presume to show our the balance of reason is on our side. It

is only just as a tip to the protagonists of rationalism and modernism that we lay down these points for consideration.

Now let us take up the beliefs regarding space and sound. The Europeans used to believe that the sound was limited to hearing and that it perished after a while. The Hindus have regarded sound as the very origin of the Universe and imperishable. The modern scientific research and the discovery of the wireless telegraphy and radio shows that the balance of reason is in our favour. The sound pervades all space; only we need the instruments to receive it. It leaves symbols on all substances. We only need the instruments and the ability to detect them.

Next let us take up the question of human enlightenment. It is but natural that the divine creator when he created man with the desire for knowledge gave also the light by which that thirst for knowledge would be satisfied. The possible vehicle of that light could either be a manifestation of his Divinity or a human being enlightened by his light. Now it cannot be that God should reserve his light and wisdom till after hundreds and thousands of years of human history had come and gone. And further that light would not be confined in its source merely to an individual. So it is that the 'Vedas' were revealed unto several *Rishies* in the very dawn of history and contained knowledge of philosophy which could hardly have been discovered by the imaginary ape-man of science.

.

Now let us take up language. Sanskrit is by common consent the most perfect and the most systematic of all languages. It is, as scholars have been led to believe, the most ancient of languages, and the base of numerous later languages of the world. In its power of expression and in the value of its literature it stands unique amongst the languages of world, and in its phonetic correctness and systematic exactitude there is no language to beat it. Thus our Sanskrit language entitles us to have precedence in the very instrument by which human thought and human history proceeds and leads us to the position that the earlier mankind was more enlightened than the moderns.

Then let us take up the sphere of Science. Here, *Aryans* the common ancestors of humanity have shown double-sided acumen. The modern scientist achieves his objects or ends by means of physical instruments. The ancients used to achieve all these things by developing psychic power. There was a double advantage in the choice of instruments. The physical instruments can be used and mastered by anybody good, bad, or indifferent. The psychic process involved no such trouble and was the more efficient. But its paramount advantage was that it could not be mastered but by austerity and self-discipline. Knowledge attained in that way was not a saleable commodity and was less liable to be misused than it is in modern times. The Rishies developed the various powers of minimizing, enlarging, and transforming their bodies.

They also mastered supernatural arts of clairvoyance, and vision of the past and the future. It is this which accounts for the perfection of the Hindu Sacred Books. In fact they did attend to science but in a way that could make science least obnoxious to the human race. It is not impossible that mankind has passed through epochs during which it accepted the more physical methods of science and later threw them off as living a balance of mischief almost irreparable.

As regards the more popular sciences of Mathematics, Astrology, and Medicine, it is well known that they first developed in India and went to Europe after passing through Arabia and Greece. In Geometry, I was told by a good authority that Euclid's arrangement and treatment of propositions are far behind those of the classic mathematicians of India. As regards Medicine the fore-thought and fore-sight of the Indians were remarkable in the same manner as in science and the art of warfare. In all these the emphasis was laid on the quality of the disciple. They took care of the learner and the learning took care of itself. The art of medicine was not to be taught to anybody and everybody *en masse*. The future physician was primarily to be a *good man* possessed of those qualities which would make his art a boon and a blessing to men. There is no denying the fact that Hospitals and Laboratories have increased; but the money-thirsty doctors are turning into a terror to mankind. There is the complaint that diseases,

infirmities and insanity have increased *pari passu* with doctors who are ever on the look out for new ways of exploiting men. The old physician, injections and operations apart, hardly kept the ordinary medicines in his dispensary which was his home. He prescribed and the patient got the drugs from the grocer for a pice or two. The Indian medical system had not only the quality of cheapness but the quality of more efficiency and greater safety. The modern doctors have a knack at getting a case more complicated instead of more cured. Wide readers must be aware also of the attacks of the Homeopathic and other systems on the prevailing system and we may leave them to settle there accounts together. In case of Astrology rationslists for a time pretended to disbelieve in anything of the kind, but they have been set at naught, more recently, by exact prophecies which came true and by numerous businessmen who make money on its calculations. There has been a growing tendency even amongst scientific men to believe in the influences of the planets and the stars on human beings as well as on the world. The pose of disregarding a thing because it is imperceptible to the present sensuous apparatus is the pose of an intellectual knave rather than a seeker of Truth.

Such intellectual knavery has exhibited itself and been smashed to pieces also in another field viz; Theosophy and Philosophy. The materialistic theory set down the whole Universe including Life itself as but a development of Matter. The ancients of the

human race told us that God alone was true, that all life is his manifestation and that this material universe was but a passing phantasmagoria. The Science to-day has taken a round and arrived at this opposite end of the pole from which it started. The whole Universe is full of life. There are no dead atoms in reality but electrons connoting pure vitality. As Sir James Jeans has accentuated the idealistic nature of the vision of the universe, Sir Olliver Lodge, on the other hand, has made experiment and inquiries which tend to prove the existence of the Soul after death. Modern Science which is in one sense the child of Materialism and in another way the father of Materialism has itself turned grey and is wondering at its ignorance and incompetence.

In intellectual perspicuity, I think, the modern Europe is pitifully below the mark. I need not refer either to the great philosophy and intellectual acquisitions of India or to those of Europe's early Greek and Roman civilisation. I am thinking of matters more at hand. It is a wonder how the thinkers and the intellectuals of Europe, not to speak of the common people, have swallowed the blatant humbugs of Liberty and Equality of men. "Man was born free" said the man who did not know what he was saying either in its literal or in its metaphorical sense. Man like all objects of nature is bound up on all sides by physical, mental, moral and spiritual conditions. He is bound by his past and bound by his present and if science can say one thing positively more than the

other, it says in the spirit of scientific determinism that he is bound by conditions all around; and yet the intellectual fondly believes without reference to his reason that man is free, and if not he should be made free and pretends to believe that he was put in chains by his own society. Then again, all men are unequal in their original potentialities and acquired powers, in their moral and intellectual capacities and also in their spiritual and historic antecedents and outfit. This fact is so patent that nobody can gainsay it; and it is equally amenable to reason that men must be treated with a view to what they are than as equals without discretion. In fact to take and treat them as equals would mean reducing human affairs to laughable absurdities. The idea of equality has already launched Communist Russia into perpetrating the tyrannies of levelisation and sovietisation. But men are so unequal that in spite of the initial injustice of plundering the rich the natural inequality again raises up its head and asserts itself even there. Of course we leave aside the particular historical truth that under such rule the government has become a welter of cruelties and atrocities till now unknown in history. Not only liberty and equality are falsehoods but a push towards them is in spite of the rule and line of Nature. It puts society in the wrong hands, it puts man on the wrong clue. It has replaced faithful Christian Civilisation by distrustful though scientifically advanced Barbarism in Europe within a couple of hundred years. In fact